

A

8176.aa.48

R E P L Y

TO THE

Rev. Mr. FLETCHER'S Vindication

OF

Mr. Wesley's Calm Address

TO

OUR AMERICAN COLONIES.

By CALEB EVANS, M.A.

*Blessed are ye when men shall revile you,—and shall
in all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake,—
so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.*

JESUS CHRIST.

B R I S T O L:

Printed and Sold by W. PINE, and all the other Book-
sellers in Bristol; and sold also by E. and C. DILLY,
&c. in LONDON.

[Price SIXPENCE.]

8176.09.48



A
R E P L Y

TO THE

Rev. Mr. *Fletcher's* Vindication, &c.

FIRST LETTER.

REV. SIR,

AS you have done me the honor of publicly addressing me upon the subject of my late dispute with Mr. *Wesley*, it would be rudeness, considering your character as a scholar and a clergyman, not to reply. I am therefore once more reluctantly drawn from the more pleasing and peaceful duties of my office as a minister of Christ, into the field of political controversy, and am constrained, unequal as I feel myself to the important task, to plead in the best manner I am able, PRO PATRIA.

A nobler cause, next to that of religion, I cannot undertake. It is the cause of LIBERTY. Not, Sir, as you most injuriously and ungenerously insinuate, "the cause of *lawless* liberty:" but the liberty, the only liberty I mean, (to

adopt the expressions of a LUMEN DECUSQUE SENATUS POPULIQUE BRITANNICI) is "a liberty connected with order, that not only exists along with order and virtue, but which cannot exist at all without them. It inheres in good and steady government as in it's substance and vital principle*." Yes sir, the liberty, the only liberty for which I plead, is BRITISH CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY, that liberty which is the very SOUL of the British empire, the brightest ornament and firmest support of the British throne. And this liberty (to borrow a little of your imagery sir,) "had I the wings of the lightning, and a voice like thunder, I would this instant shoot myself" from pole to pole and proclaim it to the whole world.

But before I enter upon a particular consideration of what you have advanced sir, upon the subject in debate, it will be proper to review the history of the controversy betwixt me and Mr. *Wesley*. For though you have officiously undertaken the vindication of this gentleman, you seem to be very much a stranger to the real state of the controversy betwixt us. From your representation of it, the reader would naturally suppose that the chief of my *personal* charges against Mr. *Wesley* was, that *five years* ago he had *doubted* whether the measures were right which the Ministry pursued respecting America. How far this representation is just, when the following facts are duly considered, let the public determine.

The publication of Mr. *Wesley's Calm Address* occasioned a greater surprize than can easily be described amongst all ranks of people. The surprize

* See Mr. *Burke's* first speech to the electors of *Bristol*.

surprise could not, I think, have been greater, had Lord *North* published a libel upon himself, and without taking the least notice of so strange a revolution in his ideas, had reprobated his own proceedings with respect to *America*, and warmly pleaded in favor of the *Americans*.

Under the signature of *Americanus*, I answered the superficial arguments contained in the *Calm Address*, and at the same time, that the public might the better judge of the merits of this POLITICAL COLOSSUS (for his performance was presently pronounced *unanswerable*) I exhibited with a little pleasantry a specimen or two of his GREAT STABILITY, to convince them how safe they were in adopting the opinions of a man who was, to be sure, by no means apt to take up his opinions or to lay them down *lightly*.

Stung with the reproach of this representation, mortified at the thought of having his laurels blasted before he was well crowned with them, poor gentleman! he totally lost ALL recollection of those unpleasing circumstances *Americanus* reminded him of, and therefore roundly *denies* them. But that *Americanus* might not take fire at having the *lie direct* given him in public, a composing pill is prepared for him, and Mr. *Wesley*, in the plenitude of his meekness, "*really believes Americanus was told so,*" but by whom does not say. He tells us indeed that a correspondent of his informs him that the letter of *Americanus* was written "*by two anabaptist ministers assisted by a gentleman and tradesman of the church of England.*" The lie might be fabricated therefore by one or other of *Americanus's* assistants, but not, as Mr. W. most charitably believes, by *Americanus* himself.

Americanus,

Americanus, greatly obliged as he could not but think himself to Mr. W. for the superabundance of his charity respecting him, was however so proud as to deem it small consolation to be exhibited to the world as only the *publisher* of a falsehood which some liar or other had fabricated for him; and he applied therefore to the gentlemen from whom he had received his information, that he might know how far what he had asserted was really true or false.

These gentlemen, amazed and confounded past all description at Mr. W.'s *absolute*, though quiet * *denial* of facts they so well knew to be true, desired time to write to him upon the subject. The first letter sent to him, was as follows.

Dear Sir,

In your preface to the new edition of the "Calm Addrefs," I meet with the following paragraph. "The book which this writer says I so strongly recommended, *I never yet saw with my eyes.* The words which he says I spoke, *never came out of my lips.* But I really believe he was told so."

I am

* It was slipped into a short *preface* to a new edition of the Calm Addrefs, which might have escaped my notice as it was printed in LONDON. and never, to the best of my knowledge, advertised for sale. It is true, after some considerable time, the zeal of Mr. W.'s partizans introduced the preface itself, at large, into most of the public papers. But it deserves particular notice, that *before* this preface appeared in the public papers Mr. W. had acknowledged in a private letter to Mr. Rouquet the truth of what he had so peremptorily *denied* in this preface, and yet he still suffers his *denial* of it to be publicly spread from one end of the kingdom to the other, without once apologizing, or empowering his friends to apologize for him, for the very strange mistake he had somehow or other fallen into. Did this wear the appearance of CANDOR or INTEGRITY?

"I am really concerned at being reduced to the painful necessity of reminding you, that upon *your* recommendation of it, I purchased that book, intitled, "An Argument in defence of the exclusive right claimed by the Colonies to tax themselves." That at my house you very strongly recommended it to your brother, and urged him to read it, as a treatise which had given *you* the fullest satisfaction upon the point, and would unquestionably convince *him* also, that the Americans were an oppressed, injured people, and that Great Britain had no right whatever to tax them: that at my house you advised me to lend it to him for that purpose, which I accordingly did upon the spot.

"Hence it should appear that somehow or other you must have fallen into a great mistake. As also your Bristol correspondent has done, if by the *assisting* gentleman he means *me*. For in truth I knew not even of Mr. *Evans's* intention to answer you till his answer was fully written.—However, thus much I must acknowledge, that the words which, he says, you spoke, were indeed spoke by you to *me*, and to many others, who are ready, when called upon, to give the amplest proof of it.

"At the time you so expressed yourself concerning the Americans, and the book in question, I every where reported your words, and upon *your* authority recommended that book. Supposing all the while that I acted herein quite agreeably to your own wishes. These reports passed current at that time from me and many more (Mr. *Evans* himself among others) who rejoiced to find you in these sentiments. Since that time indeed I have said the same things,

things, and much lamented that the alteration in your ideas upon the subject, should have been so sudden, and so great.

“ Mr. *Evans* therefore was undoubtedly told those things, at the time the words were spoken, and not unfrequently of late, both by me and others, upon the most indisputable evidence, and the fullest conviction that you had really spoken them. Therefore your correspondent might have given information not of *two* persons, but of two and twenty concerned (if he had so pleased) in aiding and assisting the writer of that letter. But, I again repeat it, I knew not of it, till it was written.

“ Now, dear Sir, let me beseech you seriously to consider, what can be done. *Your* reputation is concerned. So is the reputation of the gentleman and tradesman of the Church of England.—For you seem to acquit Mr. *Evans* of the falshood, and to charge it upon those two.—Mr. *Evans* is called upon to produce his authority. Amongst others, the gentleman and tradesman marked out by your correspondent, (that is, I take for granted, Mr. *Pine* and myself) must undoubtedly do justice to themselves, and declare the truth.—I am very sure, Sir, we should both of us be very sorry to find ourselves under the necessity of doing so, and if you either forgot yourself at the time you wrote, or mistook the treatise which Mr. *Evans* refers to, I beg leave to submit it to your own judgment, whether it will not be better, to write another preface to the Address, in which the mistake shall be acknowledged and corrected; and at the same time authorize Mr. *Evans*, in your name, to publish the same acknowledgment and
correction,

correction, in his preface to a new edition of his Letter.

"I beg, dear Sir, you will take this in as good part as it is really meant, that you will favor me with a *satisfactory* reply to this, and believe me to be

Your very obedient Servant,

Bristol, JAMES ROUQUET."
Nov. 6, 1775.

The traces however of all the remarkable circumstances enumerated in this letter, were so entirely worn out, that Mr. W. was still unable to recover so much as one of them. In as profound ignorance of these pretended facts as ever, he writes the following reply.

London, Nov. 8, 1775.

Dear Jemmy,

"I say, I REMEMBER NOTHING of that book, neither of title, nor of the argument. But I will send to the booksellers to-morrow for the book: and if I have read, I cannot but remember, when I see it again. Afterwards you will hear more particularly from

Your AFFECTIONATE BROTHER,

J. WESLEY.

"But remember the merits of the cause do not turn upon this."

No sooner had Mr. W. wrote this answer to Mr. Rouquet's letter, but, the next day, he receives the following one from Mr. Pine.

Bristol,

Bristol, Nov. 7, 1775.

Rev. Sir,

"Your observations on the Letter to you signed *Americanus*, (which was written by the Rev. Mr. *Caleb Evans* of Bristol) has involved me in a difficulty which I know not how to get over, without suffering in my own character, or publicly contradicting you. Therefore I beg your advice.

"The case is as follows.—In Sept. 1774, when you was in Bristol, you gave me a pamphlet, intituled, "An Argument in Defence of the exclusive Right claimed by the Colonies to tax themselves." (I have been informed since, it was written by Mr. *Parker*.) You recommended it strongly to me to put into my newspaper, as the best thing that had been written upon the subject. I accordingly published extracts from it three successive weeks, and told several persons it was a well-wrote pamphlet, and recommended by you as the best thing on the subject published.

"I never suspected you would alter your mind on that head, otherwise I should have been more on my guard; but as you spoke very freely to me, I had no reason to hesitate about the matter, but thought myself right in encouraging what you had so strongly recommended.—Some of Mr. *Evans's* friends were amongst the persons whom I desired to read the tract on your recommendation; who now call upon me for the truth of my assertion, as you have flatly denied ever "seeing the book with your eyes."—I apprehend you must have forgot the circumstances; but you will readily remember them, I doubt not, from the above particulars. Please

to

to favor me therefore with a line how I am to act, as I have desired time to write to you before I give a positive answer.

Some persons here have been very industrious in circulating lyes; and I suppose they are the same that sent you the account from Bristol, of the *four* persons concerned in writing Mr. Evans's Letter to you; tho' here they could only muster up *three*; which were Mr. Rouquet, Mr. Evans and myself. But you know (according to an old observation of your's) "stories lose nothing by carriage."—I could wish you would be more on your guard against those inventors of lyes; they are your flatterers; they are your deceivers. You would do well at least, to keep one ear open for your real friends; who wish to acquaint you with the truth: by which means you would escape many inconveniencies, as well as much reproach.

"Tho' I am not accountable for my actions to every whisperer and tale-bearer, who sets himself up in the judgment-seat to decide on my conduct; yet to you I will frankly declare the whole *previous* knowledge I had of the above letter.—The first intimation I received was, when Mr. Evans brought me the copy for printing, (for whom I have done business several years) neither was I consulted by him or any other person on the head, any more than I was about writing your Calm Address. So that you may judge what stress to lay in future on the information of those, who would invent a falsehood to be thought wiser than other people;—or perhaps to serve a party, would sacrifice you and the dearest friend they have in the world.

"I have

" I have for many years had the same respect for you as tho' you had been my father : I have much respect for you still. Actions speak louder than words. I have not admitted any thing into my paper against you, tho' I have been much importuned, and have even offended persons who have been my customers on that account. Further, I have refused printing several pamphlets that have been written against you, in which my name might have been concealed. So that I have in a measure sacrificed my interest and my friends to serve you ;--but cannot violate my conscience or truth to serve any person or cause whatever : therefore I beg you will favour me with your reasons for denying any knowledge of the above pamphlet, that I may be enabled to give a proper answer to Mr. Evans's friends, and you will greatly oblige,

SIR,

Your very obedient Servant,

W. PINE.

Mr. Pine, in the above letter, begs to know " how he was to act." After a dead silence of many days, comes the following oracular answer.

London, Nov. 14, 1775.

My Dear Brother,

" Take care you be not carried away with the torrent. You stand on slippery ground.

" I have wrote more largely to Mr. Rouquet, and refer you to his letter for particulars. Let no warm man persuade you to take any step, which you may repent as long as you live.

I am, with love to S. Pine,

Your affectionate Brother,

J. WESLEY.

But

But now let us hear the capital letter to Mr. *Rouquet*, referred to in the answer to Mr. *Pine*, and which is to serve as a directory to them both. And behold, in this letter he revives from his delirium, and his memory is restor'd to him. But, marvellously four'd at the disturbance he had met with in his pleasing reverie, from these rigid creatures who would not *violate conscience or truth* to serve *any person or cause* whatever, he no more addresses his friend *Rouquet* under the *usual* and familiar appellation of *Dear Femmy*, but, with brow severe, adopts the stiffer epithet of —.

Dear JAMES,

London,

Nov. 13, 1775.

"I will now simply tell you the thing as it is. As I was returning from the North to the Leed's conference, one gave me the tract which you refer to, part of which I read in my journey. The spirit of it I observed to be admirably good: and I *then* thought the argument conclusive: in consequence of which I suppose (tho' I DO NOT REMEMBER it) I recommended it both to you and others. But I had so intirely forgotten it, that even when it was brought to me the other day, I COULD NOT RECOLLECT that I had EVER seen it.

"See the difference now between Mr. Evans's spirit and mine: when I thought he said what was not true (tho' he was the aggressor, and had attacked me, not in a good-natured nor a genteel manner) I immediately made an excuse for him: "But I really believe he was told so." Does he, when the tables are turned, make an excuse for *me*? Does he say, "I really believe

B

he

he had forgot it?" To have done this would have been no way unworthy either of a gentleman or a Christian. Especially considering the merits of the cause do not at all turn upon it.

"If you have a mind to press the thing farther, do, and let it stand as an EVERLASTING MONUMENT, to all the world, OF THE GRATITUDE of *William Pine* and *James Rouquet*, to

JOHN WESLEY.

Mr. *Pine* had desired to know how he should act, Mr. *Rouquet* had requested him to make an apology for his mistake; and observe his answer. He confesses that he had seen the book in question, and once thought it *conclusive*, tho' he DID NOT REMEMBER ever to have recommended it, and when it was brought to him the other day COULD NOT RECOLLECT that he had EVER seen it. So that when, or how, or by what means he remembered it's having been put into his hands as he was going to the *Leed's* conference, we are for the present, left to conjecture.

He observes to them however, how much more excellent his spirit was than mine, and that if they were determined to press the matter farther, that is to urge him to a *public* acknowledgment of his *public* mistake, or to empower Mr. *Evans* to do it for him, they might. And let it stand, says he, as an everlasting monument of your GRATITUDE.

Having thus given his two troublesome and disagreeable correspondents their *quietus*, and dared them to say one word more upon the subject, upon pain of being petrified into *everlasting* monuments to the whole world, of GRATITUDE

TUDE to *John Wesley*;—he hoped he should have been in peace.

But ah! vain hope! *Americanus* still thinking that a *public mistake* should be as *publicly acknowledged* and rectified, reiterates the charge, produces his authorities, and offers to confirm them by oath, having previously informed the parties concerned, that he should, if necessary, demand their oath before a magistrate for that purpose.

The laborious *Mr. Wesley* could not however find time to make any *public acknowledgment* of the mistake he was charged with. He did it is true, find time to slip aside the obnoxious paragraph out of the preface to a new edition of his *Addresses*, without even hinting whether it was done through chance or design, or saying one word about the reason of the omission. He did also find time to write a *public answer* to the supposed reasons which had been *privately suggested* for his writing the "*Calm Address*." And he did also, somehow or other, find time, as one of his retainers under the signature of *W. A.* (in the *London Packet* of Dec. 6th.) tells us, to give vent to the fervent piety of his heart, and to discharge some of the overflowings of his benevolence to *Messrs. Rouquet and Pine*, in a sermon on *Christian zeal*, in which, as the said *W. A.* informs us, he used the following expressions. "*Let Mr. Rouquet and Mr. Pine make what affidavits they please, I will pity them, and recommend them to God in my prayers, however they may endeavor to stab my reputation.*" What an amiable temper does the good man discover! Was there ever, even an apostle, that breathed a more excellent spirit? I will

PITY them because THEY HAVE most certainly TOLD THE TRUTH, and I will RECOMMEND THEM TO GOD IN MY PRAYERS, notwithstanding they are so shamefully *ungrateful* that they WILL NOT, even to save my reputation, TELL A LYE. To what surprising heights does Mr. W.'s piety and benevolence exalt him!

The fervor of his heart in so compassionately *pitying* and pathetically *praying* upon this occasion for his friends *Rouquet* and *Pine*, might perhaps be the reason of his *forgetting* all this while to make any *public acknowledgment* of the error he had through *forgetfulness* already committed, in *publicly denying* the truth of what *Americanus* had asserted; and it became necessary therefore again to jog his memory. This was accordingly done, through the medium of the public papers, in the following letter.

To the Rev. JOHN WESLEY.

Rev. Sir,

"As I find by the letter you lately published in the London Chronicle, that whatever contempt you may chuse to express for *news-writers*, you are not averse, when it suits you, to become one yourself; I take the liberty, through the channel of a *news-paper*, of addressing a few lines to you, relative to the controversy subsisting betwixt us, originally respecting America; but in which, as the matter now stands, our *personal characters* are very nearly interested.

"In my letter to you, under the signature of *Americanus*, occasioned by your Calm Address to the Colonies, in order that the public might
be

be the better able to judge of the deference due to your political opinions, I publicly reminded you of the few following facts.

" That you had asserted in print, you doubted whether the measures taken with respect to America could be defended either on the foot of *law*, *equity*, or *prudence*.—That you had freely asserted in various companies, that in your opinion the Americans were an OPPRESSED, INJURED PEOPLE, and that if they submitted to taxation, they must be either FOOLS or KNAVES. That you strongly recommended a book intitled, " An Argument in defence of the exclusive right claimed by the Colonies to tax themselves;" and, as hath since appeared, even desired Mr. *Pine* to print extracts from it in his news-paper. Unwilling to appear as great a *Proteus* in politics as you have long appeared in *divinity*, you deny the charge. Your words are, see p. 6, of the preface of your new edition to the *Calm Address*,—" The book which this writer says I so strongly recommended, *I never yet saw with my eyes*; and the words which he says I spoke, *never came out of my lips*. But I really believe he was told so."

" But supposing what I asserted was false, it is not easy to conceive what reason you could have for believing *I was told so*. For you will please to recollect, Sir, that at this time I was perfectly *unknown* to you, and appeared only under the signature of *Americanus*.

" However, as I still stood before the public as the *publisher* of a falsehood, I thought it necessary to give the public my name, and my authorities for what I had asserted concerning

you. I did this some weeks ago, in the preface to a new edition of my letter, printed for *E. and C. Dilly*.

"I expected an immediate reply, but have hitherto expected it in vain. I now, therefore, publicly call upon you for it. The public have a right to it.

"As you say you have one foot already in the grave, you will excuse me, Sir, if I take the liberty of telling you, that before the other foot is there too, it would well become you, instead of exposing your grey hairs by such low scurrility as talking of people's licking up Mr. *Toplady's* spittle, to prove yourself an *honest man*—Advice, long since offered you by the amiable Mr. *Hervey*; and which you will not therefore, it is hoped, be offended with having presented to you now, by

Your humble Servant,

Bristol,

CALEB EVANS."

Dec. 4, 1775.

This letter, awaking Mr. W. from the pious trance he had been in for several weeks, behold, without any further loss of time, forth comes this *public reply* to it.

To the Rev. Mr. CALEB EVANS.

Rev. Sir,

"You affirm, 1. That "I once doubted whether the measures taken with respect to America, could be defended either on the foot of law, equity, or prudence." I did doubt of this five years, nay indeed, five months ago.

"You affirm, 2. That "I declared (last year) the Americans were an *oppressed*, injured people."

I do

I do not remember that I did; but very possibly I might.

"You affirm, 3. That I then "strongly recommended an argument for the exclusive right of the colonies to tax themselves." I believe I did; but I am now of another mind.

"You affirm, 4. "You say in the preface, *I never saw that book.*" I did say so: the plain case was, I had so intirely forgotten it, that even when I saw it again, I recollected nothing of it, till I had read several pages. If I had, I might have observed, that *you* borrowed more from Mr. P. than I did from Dr. *Johnson*; though I know not whether I should have observed it; as it does not affect the merits of the cause.

"You affirm, 5. "You say, *but I really believe he was told so:*" And add, supposing what I asserted was false, it is not easy to conceive what reason you could have for believing *I was told so.*" My reason was, I believed you feared God, and therefore would not tell a wilful untruth. So I made the best excuse for you, which I thought the nature of the thing would admit of. Had you not some reason to believe this of *me*? And therefore to say (at least) "I hope he forgot it?"

"But at this time I was perfectly *unknown* to you." No: at this time I knew you wrote that tract: but had I not, charity would have induced me to hope this, even of an intire stranger?

"You have now my public reply. And if you please to advance any new argument (personal

reflections

reflections I let go) you may perhaps receive a farther reply from,

Your humble servant,

London, Dec. 9, 1775. JOHN WESLEY.

" P. S. I did not see your letter till this morning."

To this *public reply* of Mr. W. Americanus returned the following *public answer*, and closed the dispute.

To the Rev. JOHN WESLEY.

Rev. Sir,

" As you have at length favored me with your *public acknowledgment*, our controversy is at an end. To triumph over the vanquished would be ungenerous.

" It is however necessary for me to observe that your insinuating that I have taken more from Mr. P. (the author of the argument in defence of the colonies) than you have from Dr. Johnson, is an artifice to cover your own plagiarism, too thin not to be seen through by the most superficial. It is not *fact*. And if it were, it is totally beside the purpose. I have not taken a line from that or any other author without *acknowledging* it. But when you published your address, you gave not even a *hint* of having taken any part of it from Dr. Johnson, or any other writer.

" To the last edition of your address to the colonies, there is an address to *Americanus* added, by one who styles himself a *native of America*. He makes several quotations from my letter to you, and then very quietly observes in a note " *All this is taken from a tract intitled*

" *As*

"*An argument in defence of the exclusive right claimed by the Colonies to tax themselves.*" And yet it happens, not *one sentence* of the quotations he refers to was taken from that writer. When you or your assistants may again aim at *retorting*, keep to TRUTH, or you will only wound yourselves.

"But you intimate my *personal* charges against you, are foreign to the argument. I am of a different opinion. In all logical treatises there is one topic of argument called AUTHORITY. Your authority, Sir, with multitudes of your followers, you are too sensible to need to be informed of it, is *great*. My representation to the public of your amazing political versatility was calculated to *weaken* that authority. And with all impartial people, it has absolutely *destroyed* it. For it now appears that it is not only *possible*, but *probable*, that in a few months you may *totally forget* that you ever read a tract intitled "*Taxation no Tyranny*," and having extracted the chief arguments from it, gave them to the public under the form of a "*Calm Address to our American Colonies*, by John Wesley, M. A." And when you have *totally forgotten* this, who knows in what style you may write next?

"If you *perfectly knew* I was the author of *Americanus*, where was your candor or integrity in making the public believe *Americanus's* letter was written by "*two Anabaptist ministers assisted by a gentleman and tradesman of the church of England*?"

"I will only add, when you have answered the arguments I have already produced, it will be time enough to think of advancing *new* ones.

But

But till you have done this, you will not I believe hear again from me

Bristol, Your humble Servant,
Dec. 16, 1775. CALEB EVANS."

Having thus given you, Sir, a faithful narrative of the rise, progress, and conclusion of the dispute betwixt me and Mr. *Wesley*, you are welcome to re-enter on the vindication of your friend as you stile him, as soon as you please. And should you find yourself unequal to the *Herculean* task, and, with all the thick clouds of your wordy declamation, (almost as destructive to the light of TRUTH as those "*missile implements of impotent rage*" you so SUBLIMELY speak of are to our windows,) that you are nevertheless unable to raise dust enough quite to put out the eyes of your readers,—you may call in the assistance of the AMAZING Mr. *Thomas Olivers*,* that MIRROR of Christian MEEKNESS and

* See a curious display of the abilities of this AMAZING man, in a late tract, intitled, "*A FULL DEFENCE of the Rev. John Wesley, in answer to the several personal reflections cast on that gentleman by the Rev. Caleb Evans, in his Observations, &c.*"

In this tract he rings an AMAZING number of charges upon the word AMAZING. He presents us also with an AMAZING account of the "*Calm Address*," the bones of which he acknowledges were taken from Dr. *Johnson's* tract, price EIGHTEEN-PENCE, but then he insists upon it these bones were put each into its own place, covered with flesh and skin, and the whole set in motion by Mr. *Wesley*: in consequence of which it swelled to such an AMAZING bulk, that it could not be sold for less than TWO-PENCE! He hints also at an AMAZING discovery, from my using the word *versatility*, that Dr. *Priestley* (who, as far as I know, is to this hour ignorant of the very existence both of the *Calm Address* and my *Answer* to it,) was concerned in writing my Letter to Mr. *W.*!—Mr. *Olivers* has however paid me, I suppose *undesignedly*, a very high compliment, in supposing that Dr. *Priestley* had any hand in writing the Letter to Mr. *W.* or the *Observations upon Mr. W.'s Reply*; for

and MODESTY, and with HIS LOGIC and YOUR ORATORY, aided by scraps of mutilated letters, you will perform wonders.

Your operations, you may depend upon it, will not be disturbed, but contemplated with *silent admiration*, by

Your humble Servant,

Bristol,

CALEB EVANS.

Feb. 14, 1776.

SECOND

however widely Dr. PRIESTLEY's *religious* sentiments may differ from mine, it is well known, that in extent of capacity, sound learning, and the union of solid and splendid talents, he has scarcely an equal, most certainly not a superior.—In the walks of science, it would be my highest ambition to follow so able a Leader, though I am conscious it must ever be—*haud passus equis*.

SECOND LETTER.

Rev. Sir,

LONG before I had the pleasure of seeing your Letters, which were put into my hands but a few days ago, I was amused with a very extraordinary account of them, and had my expectations highly raised concerning them. It was reported that they were penned with uncommon keenness, had been revised by Mr. *John Wesley*, and finally, that they had passed under the review of Lord *Dartmouth*, and received many corrections and additions from the pen of this celebrated nobleman. I cannot vouch for the truth of my intelligence, but, swoln as my expectations were, before I had read many pages of the work of this most respectable triumvirate, for so I considered it,—*Hæu! QUANTA despe decidit!*—I confess, Sir, I was disappointed!—Instead of argument I meet with nothing but declamation, instead of precision artful colouring, instead of proof presumption, instead of consistency contradiction, instead of reasoning a string of sophistries. Your letters abound, Sir, as every intelligent reader will easily discover, with the *petitio principii*, the *fallacia accidentis*, the *non causa pro causa*, and those many other pretty inventions, by which, as the schoolmen very well know, a question may be embarrassed when it cannot be answered.

Sometimes you talk of our *excellent constitution*,

tion, then you burlesque it, turning into perfect ridicule the explanation that has been given of it by a *Montesquieu* and a *Blackstone*, two of the ablest civilians who have ever written upon the subject.—In one page you tell us, that by the word SOVEREIGN you mean the King and his parliament; in the very next page you tell us the SOVEREIGN has a RIGHT to LIVE by his noble, (you had almost said) divine business. So that a member of parliament, instead of vacating his seat upon his accepting a place, ought to have a place provided for him upon his becoming a member of the legislature. You will not therefore fail to recommend it to administration to make a suitable provision for some of those “new triumphators, who have been drawn in their chariots by a new species of domestic animals, who with *leonine* fierceness and *asine* meanness (according to your humorous account of them, and you see how fond I am of embellishing my page with some of your SUBLIMITIES) have turned themselves into coach-horses.” For you know, Sir, some of these “triumphators” are members of parliament, and every SOVEREIGN has a right to live by his business, and by the SOVEREIGN you mean the King, and his parliament. Nor do you ever hint at your changing the meaning of the term.—One while you talk of moderate taxes, for ends beneficial to the whole empire and conducive to the general good, and tell us that our constitution GUARDS our properties, liberties and lives against the tyranny of unjust, arbitrary or cruel monarchs, then you preach up with great solemnity the doctrine of the DIVINE RIGHT of Sovereigns, and that their subjects have no more right to resist than children or scholars have a right to

take away paternal or magisterial authority. So that if their taxes should be ever so *immoderate*, and instead of being appropriated to the *public good* are prostituted to the pampering of venal slaves who are the pest of a community, and though their sovereign should be ever so unjust, arbitrary, and cruel, there is no help for them. When this DIVINE RIGHT of tyranny appears, the *guardianship* of the constitution vanishes. And the calling this a *Jacobite doctrine* does no more make it unreasonable, you observe, than my calling Mr. W. a slave, deprives him of his liberty.—In one breath you profess “sincerely to love and honor me as an enemy to TYRANNY,” and through the whole of your letters in every other place, you take huge pains to prove me a zealous friend and warm abettor of that worst of all tyrannies, the tyranny of King MOB, and the army of the pot-boilers.—In one letter you tell us, “*the Colonists are on a level with Britons in general* ;” in another, that “*they were never on a level with England*.”

What end you can propose to yourself by such loose, inconsistent, vague declamation, it is not easy to say. It may confound the ignorant and superficial; but you cannot yourself suppose it can ever convince the intelligent and impartial.

Your chief aim seems to be, *spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas*, and thereby artfully to persuade them that all those who are enemies to the measures of the ministry respecting America, who DOUBT (as Mr. W. himself did about *five months ago*) whether any man can defend these measures on the foot of *law, equity, or prudence*, are Republicans, King-baters, Calvinists, Anabaptists, Antinomians, and every thing that is
bad.

bad, and that they are endeavoring *secretly* to overturn both church and state, and ought therefore to be abhorred and detested by all those pious people who fear God and honor the king. Who can read your letters, and not be struck with the illustrious example you have exhibited of that divine charity which *thinketh no evil*!

By your manner of writing it might naturally be supposed that I had denied the necessity or propriety of subjects paying taxes, that I had been so unreasonable as to suppose that government might be supported without a revenue, without an army, a militia, sea-ports, docks, fortifications, garrisons, convoys, fleets of observation, ministers at foreign courts, arms, artillery, ammunition, magazines:—in short, that I was one of the most unreasonable beings in the universe; and a meer political *Quixote*. Your readers must undoubtedly be very much edified by your most elaborate high-wrought demonstration of this leading point, that a *great revenue* is necessary to the support of civil government! But really sir, I should have been more obliged to you, if you had first of all informed me who ever denied it.

Your similes of a school-master, a lawyer, a physician and a nurse, are to be sure very pretty similes, and who will dare to say that they do not fully prove the point in dispute? That the king is not to be paid by the representatives of the people according to the judgment *they* may form of the exigencies of the state, but that he is intitled to just what he pleases, and may take it with or without their consent whenever he thinks proper. If your similes do not prove this, they prove nothing. And who will

affirm that they *do not* prove this? Will you withhold from a school-master, the price you *agreed* to pay for your childrens education? From a lawyer or a physician, their lawful accustomed fees, which every one who voluntarily employs them, acknowledges himself willing to pay? Or from a nurse, will you withhold the wages you bargained to pay her? How then can you be so impious as to think of withholding from the king, (mark the consequence!) whatever *he sees fit* to demand of you? Your reasoning, sir, like a mighty torrent, bears down all before it!

In like manner, your proofs that the sovereign has a right to dispose of our *money, liberty and life* WITHOUT OUR CONSENT, are as clear as any demonstrations in *Euclid*. The king obliges the man that owes me money, to pay it, with or *without* his consent! He obliges an idle drunken fellow to sit an hour or two in the stocks, *without* asking his leave! And absolutely hangs a highwayman or a murderer, *without* once asking whether they *choose* to be hanged! —Had you informed your readers that in England, the sovereign has no power to recover a debt even for himself but *according to law*; no power to punish a thief till he has been legally tried *according to law*; that a British subject may *go to law with the king* as well as the king with him; and that *no law* can be passed *without the consent* of the commons, it might have somewhat *obscured* your reasoning: but as it now stands, it is *unanswerable*, and Mr. W. himself will be, I fear, at a loss for epithets sufficiently to extol it.

Because I say from Lord Camden, that “taxation and representation are inseparably united: that

that this position is founded on the laws of nature, and is itself an eternal law of *nature*:" you very shrewdly observe that by *nature* then must be meant the *fallen nature* of men, and hereby, as every reader must at once see, entirely demolish Lord Camden's position! The noble Lord further says, Taxation and representation God hath joined;—you reply, you charge *nonsense* upon God, and *robbery* upon the king. Who could desire a more *satisfactory* answer? His Lordship, to prove his position, goes on to argue—"Whatever is a man's own, is *absolutely his own*, no MAN hath a right to take it from him without his consent, either expressed by himself or representative." Scarcely able to restrain your wrath at so daring a speech, you vehemently exclaim, "nothing can be more false, sir—I do not scruple to assert, that this principle is *detestable*:"—but why? "It is, say you, to shake off the yoke of God's supreme dominion." Very good, sir! To say that no MAN hath a right to take my property from me without my consent, by myself or representative, is to shake off the yoke of God's supreme dominion. I think I understand you. So that if a highwayman should attack me and demand my money, it would be *detestable* were I to assure him it was *absolutely my own*, and that no MAN had a right to take it from me *without my consent*; for this would be, I find, to shake off the yoke of God's supreme dominion. Thank you, sir, for the information, I assure you it is quite new.

As to the *delegated dominion* of kings, law-givers, and magistrates, who are, you tell us, God's *lieutenants* and *representatives*; unless you

had explained more fully the nature of this delegated dominion, and whether it authorises them to rob us on the highway, or to take what they please from us in any other method, it is impossible to comprehend what you mean. You are however very certain, that if what a man has is *absolutely his own*, it follows as an *indubitable consequence*, that non-voters and foreigners, who never consented to our laws, either personally, or by appointing their representatives, can never be *taxed, imprisoned, or hanged*, unless they first sign the warrants by which their property, liberty or life is legally disposed of. That your reasoning may not fail carrying conviction to the dullest understanding, permit me to complete your syllogism for you thus. But *you may be taxed, imprisoned, or hanged*, without signing the warrants yourself; *therefore*, to say that what you have is *absolutely your own*, and that no MAN has a right to take it from you *without your consent*, expressed by yourself, or representative, is *detestable*, and to throw off the yoke of GOD's supreme dominion, AND the delegated dominion of HIS LIEUTENANTS. Now, sir, if there really are any lieutenants here on earth, who have a right to take from us *what they please*, we have nothing that is *absolutely our own*; but the dominion of these *lieutenants*, you'll remember is not as yet *proved*, you have only taken it for granted.

You divert yourself mightily, sir, with the specimens you have exhibited of *abject slavery*, in order to ridicule the doctrine I had laid down, that to be taxed without being represented was the *quintessence* of slavery. But stripping off the gaudy robes of *oratory* with which you have arrayed your arguments, let us see what sort of an appearance

pearance they make in the more simple attire of a logical dress. I am afraid you'll hardly know them, they cut so awkward a figure. But here they enter.—*Because* the constitution does not allow our blooming young men from seventeen years of age, to twenty-one, to vote for parliament men here in England, *therefore* the constitution does not allow young or old men in America, to vote for representatives, but we have a right to dispose of their property without any representatives at all. *Because* the constitution does not permit English widows nor women of any class to have a voice in the legislature; *therefore* it does not permit American widowers nor men of any class to have a voice in it. *Because* a man in England can have no voice in the disposal of his property, whose estate amounts to no more than *thirty-eight or thirty-nine* shillings per annum; *therefore* it is perfectly constitutional to exclude the Americans from having a voice in the disposal of their property, whose estates may amount to *thirty-eight or thirty-nine* pounds per annum. *Because* Lord Clive and Lord Pigott cannot vote when they are *abroad*; *therefore* the Americans ought not to vote when they are *at home*. *Because* an English representative may happen not to be present when a tax is laid upon his land, and the land of his constituents; *therefore* there is no need that the Americans should have any representatives. *Because* every collective body must necessarily submit to the determinations of the *majority* of that body, to which they belong; *therefore* the Americans ought to submit to the taxation of the British parliament, though they do not belong to that body, and have not a single voice in the election

tion of any one person that does. Nay, further, (for you say you will *press me closer still*)—*Because* many bills pass in parliament, which the patriotic members *opposed* with all their might, and which were passed therefore absolutely *AGAINST* their consent, *therefore* there is no manner of occasion for the Americans to have any members at all, either to propose or oppose, to consent or dissent!

From all which it appears as clear as the daylight, that the Colonists "*are on a level* as you express it, p. 23, *not only with Britons in general, but with all our members of parliament who are ABOARD.*" So that the poor Colonists, after all, and notwithstanding you tell us they ought to be addressed as *freemen*, and considered as *younger brothers*, and bound to their mother country by "the silken cords of pardoning love, and by the silver bands of some prerogatives," yet are NEVER AT HOME! Were I a Colonist, the silver prerogative I would humbly sue for should be that of being permitted to be *at home*, for home is home, says the old proverb, be it ever so homely.

But still you will have it, that according to my doctrine, all those persons in England who have no votes for parliament men are taxed *without their own consent*, and consequently are, if my doctrine be true, *abject slaves*. You affirm this, sir, but how do you prove it? Why by another affirmation, that by representation I constantly mean *direct* representation. And yet you afterwards tell me *I come back* to the idea of *indirect* representation; and that if Mr. Locke, and my noble auxiliaries Lord Chatham and Lord Camden mean an *indirect* representation,

tion, you assent to their assertion. Well, sir, be it then known to you that I *never* meant to assert, that *Birmingham* was *directly* represented, but only *indirectly*, as a part of the county of *Warwick*. That I never imagined minors, widows, maidens, bed-ridden or imprisoned burghesses, or any of the other classes of non-voters were *directly* represented, but only *indirectly* or *virtually*. And finally that I never thought it necessary a thief or a murderer should sign the warrant for his own execution. And yet still, sir, I again affirm, without the *least* hesitation, in the words of the noble Lord before mentioned, that "taxation and representation are coeval with and essential to this constitution; that whatever is a man's own, is absolutely his own, no MAN hath a right to take it from him without his consent, either expressed by himself or representative; whoever attempts to do it, attempts an injury, whoever does it commits a robbery, he throws down the distinction betwixt *liberty* and *slavery*." Your exclamations of "What a speech! God save the king from such severe judges as you are! If you are in the right the sovereign is a *tyrant*, taxing the colonies is *robbery* and enforcing such taxation by the sword is *murder*!"—carry *prodigious* conviction to the mind, and irrefragably prove, no doubt, the falshood of Lord *Camden's* doctrine! Permit me, however to remind you, sir, that it is a maxim in British politics, that the KING *can do no wrong*. Nor can you have a more flattering idea of the *personal* dispositions of the present reigning prince, than I have ever been desirous of entertaining. But if all that the *ministry* do must be *right*, because *the king* is always

ways supposed incapable of doing wrong; and if we are not to be allowed to reason upon the conduct of *administration*, without being supposed guilty of personal disrespect to the *king*, farewell English liberty.

Your reasoning upon the quotation I made from the very learned Judge *Blackstone*, (who was, I believe, never before suspected of too great a partiality to the *popular party*) is equally conclusive with that you make use of to confute Lord *Camden's* doctrine. "In a *free state*, (says Judge *Blackstone*) EVERY MAN who is supposed a free agent, ought to be in some measure *his own governor*; and therefore a branch at least of the legislative power should reside in the *whole body of the people*." You reply,—"Your *scheme* drives at putting the legislative power in every body's hands, that is at crowning king *Mob*." Pray, sir, is Judge *Blackstone* a Calvinist, an Anabaptist, an Antinomian patriot,—or what is he? For it is *his scheme* you'll remember, sir, that aims at crowning king *Mob*, raising the army of the pot-boilers, and creating the four hundred thousand tyrants, you speak of, instead of three hundred and ninety-nine.

But withdrawing from the smoke of your cloudy verbosity, what have you advanced to disprove the positions, either of Lord *Camden* or Judge *Blackstone*? I venture to affirm, not a single syllable. If what a man has is not *absolutely his own*, if there be any MAN, call him by what name you please, who has a right to take it from him *without his consent*, expressed by himself or representative, what is this but the *quintessence of slavery*? *Wherein* does the case of such a man differ from that of the most abject slave?

slaves in the universe? God's lieutenants may, it is true, be very mild and kind and reasonable in their demands, and require no more from such a man, than it is highly just and reasonable, as to the *sum* itself, he should pay;—but what then? If my property is at *their disposal* not *my own*, and they have a right to take what *they please*;—what becomes of my *liberty*? The man that *robs* me of five shillings only, commits a *robbery* as much as the man that robs me of five pounds. The most abject slave in the universe may chance to have a very good master, who may use him with great humanity; but still if he is at *the disposal* of his master, not his own, he is as much a slave as the poor wretch that “silently bleeds under the lash and dies.” Slavery, considered in its principle, does not depend upon the *treatment* of the slave, for if he is deprived of his liberty, and is at the disposal of another, he is equally a slave when treated well as when treated ill. Suppose the house of Lords were to pass a money-bill independent of the Commons, and the king should give his assent to it;—would the question be whether the bill were, simply considered, *reasonable*? Whether the tax imposed by it were *equitable*? Whether there was not a necessity that the king should have a *great revenue* to support the navy, army, and so forth? No, sir, but the previous grand question would be, is not this *unconstitutional*? Is not this a fundamental breach of the privileges of *the people*? Is it not a most daring violation of that British liberty with which the constitution of this country hath made us free? And if so, were it but a pepper-corn that was demanded, no man that deserves

deserves the name of a BRITON would pay it, unless compelled. However *easy* the payment might be, it would be establishing a destructive precedent, it would be throwing down the barriers betwixt liberty and slavery, and *stabbing*, as far as in us lay, the vitals of the constitution.

The well-ballanced constitution of Great Britain, not only *forbids* the passing of any money-bill *without the consent* of the Commons, but sacredly *appropriates* to them the framing of ALL money-bills, and consequently the giving and granting of all the money by which government is supported. And this privilege is the grand BULWARK of British freedom. Establish the right of another man to take from me *what he pleases*, and though he should actually take perhaps only a *shilling* in a year, I am a *slave*, I have *nothing* I can call *my own**. But let it be allowed that what I have is *absolutely my own*, and may not be disposed of *without my consent*, by myself or representative, and though I may and ought cheerfully to pay *many pounds* in a year to the support of government, I am a *free-man*. This point is so clear, that I should think

* Thus the patriots of Charles's days argued. (You may call them if you chuse it *mock* patriots, or *slavesman* patriots, or what you please. Your nick-naming them will not destroy their patriotism, or lessen that virtuous praise with which their memories have been long embalmed. There are *hypocrites* in religion, but I suppose you would not have us hence infer that there is no truth in religion itself, or that there are no truly religious people.)—"It is not, that *ship-money* hath been levied against us; but it is, that thereby *ship-money* is *claimed*, which is the gift and EARNEST PENNY OF ALL WE HAVE: it is not, that our persons have been imprisoned, for the payment of *ship-money*, but that our PERSONS AND LIVES are, upon the *same ground of law*, delivered up to *will and pleasure*. It is that our BIRTHRIGHT is destroyed, and that there hath been an endeavor to reduce us to a *lower state than villainage*." Lord Clarendon

it a shameful waste of time to attempt any further illustration of it.

But what becomes of the *non voters* in Great Britain? I answer, they are represented by the voters. And they are indirectly or *virtually* represented by the several members that are chosen for the respective counties or boroughs in which their property lies. Should the Chancellor at the time of a General Election not issue out a writ for the election of members to represent in parliament, say the county of *Glocester*, in which a wealthy widow, who is a non-voter, has a large estate; would the landholders of that county be liable to pay the land-tax? No, Sir, any civilian will assure you they would not. The non-voting widow would not be liable to pay it. And for this obvious reason. Because her property would not be *represented* in parliament. Having no specific representative of her property, she would not be liable to have it taxed. The non-voters here, can point out their *virtual* representatives, as clearly as the voters can point out their *direct* representatives. But who are the specific *virtual* representatives of *America*? Who are appointed to represent the property there? The *Bishop* of *LONDON*, is, I think, a kind of representative or rather ruler of the *Clergy* in *America*; but are the members for *London* appointed to be the representatives of the *property* of the Americans? If not, who are their *virtual* indirect representatives?

Besides, the non-voters here retain a very considerable degree of *actual* power in the disposal of their property, I mean a *controlling* power. The freehold of a widow, maiden, or

D

minor,

minor, can only be taxed in common with the freehold of a representative himself. The tea and sugar, the salt, the candle, the shoes, the tobacco, the snuff, the gin, the ale, the rum, of the 212 non-voting families in your parish, are taxed only in common with the tea and sugar, &c. of the 78 voters. Were it not for this important *controlling* power, every non-voter would be a slave. Were the representatives at liberty to tax the estate of a *voting* freeholder at *one shilling* in the pound, and that of a *non-voting* freeholder at five or ten shillings in the pound; or were they at liberty to tax the gin and ale of your parishioners, without subjecting their own gin and ale to the same tax; the non-voters, it is evident, would have nothing they could call their own, and would therefore not be *freemen* but *slaves*.

That the representation in England is *unequal*, owing to a great variety of casual circumstances which it would be useless to enumerate, you yourself allow. And if it be *unequal*, must not this be a *defect* in the constitution? But how you can hence infer that I want to bring about a "*revolution*" in order to remedy this defect; that I take upon me to "*mend the constitution*;" am for a "*levelling scheme*," and wish to put the government into the hands "*of the pot-boulers*;" you have not condescended to explain. That no such thoughts ever entered into my heart, and that no words of this import ever escaped from my lips or pen, I can most confidently affirm before him who searcheth the heart and knows all things. Now, though you have dignified me with the appellation of *Antinomian* patriot, yet I always regarded the law of God as
a rule

a rule of life, and would therefore recommend to your most serious consideration, that sacred precept, the language of which is, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."--I revere the constitution, with all its defects, from my inmost soul, and am ready to acknowledge, that "to be a subject of Great Britain, with all its consequences, is to be the freest subject of any civil government in the world."

But is one of these consequences, being taxed *without being represented*? You tell me the Americans *are* as much represented, that is *indirectly*, as the vast body of non-voters here in England. But I have already shewn, that they are not. Who are the *virtual* representatives of American property? If the British parliament assume the right of disposing of it, what voice have the Americans, directly or indirectly, in the disposal of it? Or what *controlling* power have they over those that assume the power of disposing of it for them? None at all. They are under every possible temptation to abuse this power, since every shilling taken out of the pocket of an American would be so much saved in their own. And what *liberty* could an *American* then pretend to boast of?

This, as you justly observe, is my *capital* argument. Let us impartially consider, what you call your *full answer* to it. You divide it into six particulars.

I. "It is *improbable*, you say, that our law-givers would save a dirty shilling in their pockets by oppressively taking one out of an American's pocket; and that at present they take a vast deal more out of their own pockets

than they do out of the pockets of the Americans." I am of opinion, Sir, that at *present*, this surprizing moderation may be very naturally accounted for.—But I will answer your most acute supposition, by another. Suppose the Lords were to take upon them the business of taxation, *without* the Commons; might it not be pleaded, that it was not *probable* the Lords would save a dirty shilling in their pockets, by oppressively taking one out of a *Commoner's* pocket; and that at present the noblemen in general pay much more, as individuals, towards the support of government than *Commoners*?

II. "The *constitution*, you observe, obviates my *ungenerous* suspicion, by ordering that the legislators be men of fortune, raised by their circumstances above the felonious trick I speak of."—Here also, you offer another very strong argument to prove that the Lords had better take the trouble off the hands of the Commons of giving their own money. For suppose we *should* give up that power to them, who would suspect *Lords* of such a *felonious trick* as abusing their power? I suppose, Sir, if you or any of your friends should at any time lend a few thousands to any of our *legislators*, you would not pretend to ask for a *bond*. It would be *ungenerous* to suspect men of such circumstances as the constitution obliges all our *legislators* to be, of such a *felonious trick* as not paying you again.

III. "The American can have, you say, a voice in the disposal of his property, because he
may

may come over and have property here, and even be a member of parliament if duly qualified and chosen.—But, good Sir, suppose the American is a widow, a maiden, a minor, or has but *thirty-eight* shillings a year;—what voice, or what *controlling power* can be obtained then? Or suppose two or three hundred shiploads of Americans were to come over and buy estates here, and vote for members of parliament;—how could they certainly know when to come? And you'll observe the very expence of an American voyage would itself consume more property than would enable a man to become a voter here as long as he lived.

IV. You plead, “That there are many members of both houses of parliament who have very large property in America, and who when they tax the Colonists take far more money out of their own pockets, than they probably do out of the pockets of Messrs. *Adams* and *Hancock*.” But what *security*, Sir, have the Americans that there will always be such members in parliament? Should there chance to be no one such member in parliament, what remedy would *Adams* and *Hancock*, and the other Americans have then? And unless *all* the members of the British parliament had *American property*, they would not be *on a level* with the non-voters in England.

V. “If the Colonists were afraid of being taxed more heavily than the rule of proportion allows, they *should* have humbly requested, you tell us, that the parliament would settle the matter by an act, &c.”—I answer, what the Colo-

D

nists

nists *should* have done is one thing, and what the British parliament *has done* is another. You may, very probably, think that I *should* conform to the established church: but verily, though I have the highest regard for many worthy members of the establishment, both clergy and laity, I should think it very *unjust* in any one to oblige me to conformity. A man that robs me on the highway, may think that I *should* have previously asked him if he did not want my money, and that I *should* have offered it to him;—but I presume this will not justify his robbing me.

VI. “ If pleading that our superiors may abuse their power over us, were a sufficient reason to shake off all *lawful* authority, you observe, that all apprentices might directly emancipate themselves; for they might adopt *my argument*, and say, my master indeed uses me well, but he is under *every possible temptation* to starve me, since every meal which he will save in denying me proper food, will be a meal saved for himself or his own children, and therefore I will cut and carve for myself, or I will acknowledge him as a master no more.”—But pray, Sir, where do I even hint that every *abuse of power* is a sufficient reason to throw off the yoke of *lawful* authority? POWER, is of all things in the world the most liable to abuse; but I never imagined that every *abuse of power* was a sufficient reason for its *annihilation*; for I am sure there could then be no such thing as civil government. But is it not the part of wisdom to *guard* as far as may be *against the abuse of power*? And would a wise man willingly give up that *controlling influence* which

which the constitution imparts to him in order that he may prevent the abuse of it? * As to the case of the apprentice, he has *all the security* against the abuse of his master's power over him which *the law* can give him. His master is just as much *bound* to give him proper food, as he is diligently and faithfully to serve his master. And what kind of relation therefore this case of a master and his apprentice has to that of the Americans' having no controuling power in the disposal of their property, I have not yet been able to discover.

So much for your FULL ANSWER to my CAPITAL ARGUMENT.

Here, Sir, I might, without any impropriety, take my leave, appealing to the public to judge betwixt us, which preponderates in the scale of impartial reason, my *capital argument*, or your *full answer* to it. But having my pen in hand, I request your patience whilst I present you with a few strictures upon some other parts of your curious performance.

In

* "There is nothing that requires more to be watched than power. There is nothing that ought to be opposed with a more determined resolution than its encroachments. Sleep in a state, as *Montesquieu* says, is always followed by slavery."

Observations on Liberty, &c. p. 18.

No farther back than the 16th century, the *Justiza* in the name of his high-spirited Barons, addressed the King of Arragon their Sovereign, upon his accession to the throne, in the following manner.—"We, who are each of us as good, and who are all together more powerful than you, promise obedience to your government, if you maintain our rights and liberties, but if not, not."

Robertson's history of Charles the 5th. v. 1. p. 283. 8vo. edit.

Such was the noble spirit of liberty which *once* inspired the Spaniard! Is it not pardonable then in a free-born Briton to be jealous, lest, e'er he is aware, he should be, what the Spaniard now is?

In answer to my appeal to the Irish, who are taxed by *their own parliament*, you reply,—“Ireland was annexed to the dominions of the Kings of England *not as a colony*, but *sister kingdom*.” True, Sir, the IRISH were our inveterate enemies, massacred in cool blood thousands upon thousands of English protestants, and would never have submitted to the government of Great Britain if they could have helped it: and it was therefore *highly proper* to allow *them* to have their own representatives and to tax themselves. But to allow these privileges to COLONISTS, to our *younger brothers*, to those who ought to be addressed as *freemen*,—is, it seems, quite preposterous. For *them* to claim the prerogatives of the IRISH is such a “stretch of lawless liberty,” as is perfectly shocking to think of.—The same may be said of Scotland also. That is a sister kingdom. And were it only for the unalterable attachment of its inhabitants to the principles of the REVOLUTION, and their important services, under the command of the Chevalier, in 1715 and 1745, to the present reigning family;—it would be highly unreasonable to deny *them* the right of *taxing themselves*. But for the *Americans*, for COLONISTS, to think of putting themselves upon a foot with SCOTCHMEN—is surely a piece of insolence not to be borne with! No wonder subscriptions are so readily entered into to support our soldiery in their *glorious* attempts to chastise such insolence, and to punish such daring invaders of “*the inherent rights of their country*.” No wonder so many high-landers

are ready to go over and cut their throats, for such unparalleled *audacity* as to think of being equal to the SCOTCH.—Besides, Scotland and Ireland, as every one knows, are at such a *distance* from us, that it would be impossible for us to know the internal state of these kingdoms, and consequently how to tax them properly, if they had not representatives of their own ;—but America is so *near* us, that there is no occasion for the Americans to have their own representatives to tax them, but *we* are very competent to this business, and can do it very well for them. In like manner, the palatinate of *Chester*, might very properly put in a *caveat* against the taxation of the British parliament, *because* they *were not represented in it*. But the colonists can put in no such exception to the British parliament, *because they are represented in it*.—Thus, sir, would I willingly make you sensible of the futility of your arguments, by bringing them to light, in the pleasant style of *mild irony*, a figure, which I remember upon a former occasion, you appeared to be particularly fond of.

If it be said, that even the COLONISTS themselves, presumptuous as it might be in them to think of an *equality* with *Scotchmen* and *Irishmen*, have nevertheless been *accustomed* to give their own money, by their own representatives in their respective assemblies, just as the Irish in their parliament, and the Scotch in ours : you reply, it is nothing to the purpose. If our respective parishes, say you, have a right to *cess* themselves with respect to their *private expences*, yet neither parish rates nor *colony rates* exempt from the taxes laid to defray the *general expences of government*. So that the colony-rates to pay
the

the salaries of their *governors*, their judges, and other officers, and in the late war, to raise, clothe, and maintain troops, &c.—were only *private colony-rates*, like our *parish-rates*,—they had no relation at all to the *general expences of government*! I can only exclaim, in your own language,—“ O Partiality, how high is thy glaring throne; and how many are thy warm votaries and sanguine advocates!”

But honest men, you further observe, dare not go from their bargain, and a charter is a *solemn bargain*, &c. Here, you tell me, I am sensible of the advantage Mr. W. has over me. But indeed, sir, you are mistaken: I am not sensible of it. Mr. W. *affirmed* there was a clause in the Pennsylvanian charter in *express terms*, subjecting them to taxation by the British legislature—and so far was I from *denying* it, that I only reasoned from well-known facts about the *construction* which ought to be put upon this clause. And from Governor Penn's examination, it clearly appears, that the Pennsylvanians never expected the clause referred to, to be interpreted in any other manner than I have represented. That they never imagined they were to be subject to *any other taxation* by the British parliament, than such as might be considered *necessary* to the *regulation of their trade**.

With

* The following quotation, from Dr. Price's most excellent pamphlet just published, which carries demonstration in every page, and breathes that noble spirit of LIBERTY, for which the author so ably pleads; may serve to illustrate this matter.

“ In the 6th of George the Second, an act was passed for imposing certain duties on all foreign spirits, molasses, and sugars, imported into the plantations. In this act, the duties imposed are said to be GIVEN and GRANTED by the parlia-

With respect to Mr. W.'s assertion about the Massachusetts charter, which he says promises the inhabitants of that colony *an exemption from taxes for seven years*, I observe in my letter, that I had been *credibly informed*, (and not having then seen the charter, I could say nothing positively about it,) that such an exemption could only refer to *quit-rents*; an exemption from which is commonly granted to the first settlers in every new colony for a certain number of years. But I am now able to speak more positively upon the subject, having read the charter referred to, as Mr. *Hutchinson* has given it in his collection of original papers, relative to this colony. And so far is it from being evident that this clause intended that at the *expiration* of the seven years, during which they were promised an *exemption* from taxes, they were

ment to the King; and this is the first *American* act, in which these words have been used. But notwithstanding this, as the act had the appearance of being only a *regulation of trade*, the colonies submitted to it; and a small direct revenue was drawn by it from them.—In the 4th of the present reign, many alterations were made in this act, with the *declared purpose* of making provision for *raising a revenue in America*. This alarmed the colonies; and produced discontents and remonstrances, which might have convinced our rulers this was *tender ground*, on which it became them to tread very gently.—There is, however no reason to doubt, but in time, they would have sunk into a quiet submission to this revenue act, as being at worst only the exercise of a power which then they seem not to have thought much of contesting; I mean the power of taxing them *EXTERNALLY*. But before they had time to cool, a worse provocation was given them; and the *stamp-act* was passed. This being an attempt to tax them *INTERNALLY*; and a direct attack on their property, by a power which would not suffer itself to be questioned; which eased *itself* by loading them; and to which it was impossible to fix any bounds; they were thrown at once, from one end of the continent to the other, into resistance and rage." Observations on the nature of civil liberty, &c. p. 61, 62.

were then to be subject (as Mr. W. contends) to taxation by parliament; that there does not appear throughout the charter, the least reference to *parliament*, or taxation by it. And this very charter, after all, is only their *old* charter, long since vacated by the wanton *Quo warranto* of Charles the II^d. In their charter granted them by *King William*, there is no such clause as Mr. W. speaks of, but on the contrary their own representatives in their General Assembly, have *full power and authority* to impose TAXES, not for *private* parish purposes alone, but for the necessary defence and support, says the king in this charter, "of our GOVERNMENT of our said *province and territory*, &c." But had I been ever so much embarrassed about the American charters, Mr. W. would have presently enabled me to have disentangled myself; for in the last edition of his address, he declares, that he granted *too much* when he allowed that the Americans had a *right* to all that was granted them by charter, since the king might be deceived in his grant, and the charter must then be *void*. Consequently, *mutatis mutandis*, the people might be deceived in accepting a charter which was inconsistent with the privileges of free natural born English subjects, the preservation of which privileges were sacredly promised to them, when they emigrated, and hereby the charter might be rendered void also. So that these *solemn bargains*, you speak of, may, you see, in the judgment of your patron himself, be very easily broken.*

Thus

* As I had not the pleasure of seeing Dr. Price's truly valuable tract, till these letters were actually in the press, I can only enrich my little piece with a *note* or two from this capital

Thus, sir, have I fairly considered, and I should not think it an empty boast, were I to say, *fully confuted*, all the pretended arguments you have urged from *reason* and the *constitution* in support of the Calm Address. And to an unprejudiced mind, I think it will appear, that it is from your wild incoherent system of politics, not from mine, that as mountain rises upon mountain, so absurdity rises upon absurdity.

E

Your

writer upon the subject. In reference to the American *charters*, p. 32, he speaks, with true dignity, as follows.

"Before I proceed, I beg it may be attended to, that I have chosen to try this question by the general principles of civil liberty; and not by the practice of former times; or by the *charters* granted to the colonies.—The arguments *for* them, drawn from these last topics, appear to me greatly to outweigh the arguments *against* them. But I wish to have this question brought to a higher test, and surer issue. The question with all liberal enquirers, ought to be, not what jurisdiction over them *Precedents*, *Statutes*, and *Charters* give, but what reason and equity, and the rights of humanity give."—And again, p. 40.

"Did they not settle under the faith of charters, which promised them the enjoyment of all the rights of *Englishmen*; and allow them to tax themselves, and to be governed by legislatures of their own, similar to ours? These charters were given them by an authority, which at the time was thought competent; and they have been rendered sacred by an acquiescence on our part for more than a century. Can it then be wondered at, that the colonies should revolt, when they found their charters violated, and an attempt made to force innovations upon them by famine and the sword?—But I lay no stress on charters. They derive their rights from a higher source. It is inconsistent with common sense to imagine, that any people would ever think of settling in a distant country on any such condition, as that the people from whom they withdrew, should for ever be masters of their property, and have power to subject them to any modes of government they pleased. And had there been express stipulations to this purpose in all the charters of the colonies, they would, in my opinion, be no more bound by them, than if it had been stipulated with them, that they should go naked, or expose themselves to the incursions of wolves and tigers."

Your arguments from *scripture* shall be considered in another letter. I will no longer detain you at present, than whilst I add—That a gentleman of a *liberal education*, a *republican* by birth, and a subject of Great-Britain *by choice*, should be so exceedingly confused in his ideas of the true nature of civil liberty in general, and of British constitutional liberty in particular, as you appear to be, is a mystery totally beyond the comprehension of Rev. Sir,

Your obedient servant,

C. E.

THIRD

THIRD LETTER.

Rev. Sir,

THE venerable authority of SCRIPTURE to which you have appealed on the subject in dispute betwixt us, is an authority to which I most readily and implicitly submit. But hitherto, though I have been accustomed to read and study my bible from my earliest infancy, I have not been able to discover that the principles of *political slavery* disgrace its sacred pages, or afford the least shadow of triumph to the most eagle-eyed and malicious enemies of our most holy religion.

Should it be made to appear that the British parliament have authority from SCRIPTURE, to tax their unrepresented brethren in *America*, and to cut their throats, burn their towns, and spread universal devastation amongst them because they do not chuse to submit to such taxation:—it would furnish a stronger objection, in my opinion, against the divine original of the sacred code, than has ever yet been produced. But nevertheless, should you indeed prove it to be a SCRIPTURE doctrine, whatever shock my feelings might receive as a man, and however my free-born mind might revolt from such a doctrine as an *Englishman*; I am not afraid to promise you the most absolute submission to it as a Christian. The authority of scripture, I revere above every other.—But

do the oracles of truth countenance tyranny, oppression, and all manner of evil? Do they overturn our natural rights as men, and destroy all our dear-bought invaluable privileges as Britons and as protestants? God forbid! The golden rule of scripture, both for governors and governed, is this: "*as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them.*" Now I presume the good people of England *would not* be willing that the Americans, in their assemblies, should tax *English property* here: and why should we therefore desire, in our parliament, to tax *American property* there?

But you plead the example and precept of the Son of God himself; a plea, which if well founded, no Christian will dispute. You harangue upon the subject very *floridly*, and as some will be ready therefore to think, very *conclusively*. After observing that "*although no Jew had a representative in the Roman senate,*" (and although ever so many other things which are supposed to make very much against the poor colonists) "*yet, rather than set a pattern, which Christians might have abused in after ages, he unveiled his godhead: his omniscience searched the depth of the sea: his omnipotence inverted the course of nature: he called the animal creation to his assistance, he wrought a miracle to PAY HIS TAX: and to whom? To a foreign power—to an Heathen prince, to a bloody tyrant;—to Tiberius, who was the third of the Cæsars.*"

It is very true, Sir. He did all this. And notwithstanding all my patriotism, it is my full determination, in like circumstances *to follow his steps*. Should this country ever be, in the
course

course of human events, brought into a state of subjection even to the GRAND TURK, and a tribute imposed upon its inhabitants, and collected by military force, if the tyrant rendered my bondage so easy as to make it tolerable, and I might hope to answer any valuable ends by living under his tyranny, I would very quietly pay the tribute. Had our blessed Lord never set me an example of this nature, I should no more have thought it *unlawful* to pay such tribute, than to give a highwayman my money, when, with a pistol at my breast, he *demand*s it. Could I effectually resist this highwayman, and had I any reason to hope I might thereby frustrate his unjust attempts, I most certainly would do it. And sooner than submit to the GRAND TURK, whilst there was any prospect of being able to avoid such submission by a manly resistance, I would cheerfully risk my fortune and my life. Nor can I see how my being a Christian would render such a conduct sinful. Is the *dulce pro patria mori*, the exclusive property of pagans? My views of Christianity, Sir, are not so contracted and confined. I find *Paul*, the great apostle of the Gentiles, insisting on the privileges of a *Roman*: and can it then be sinful in me to plead, or even fight, should there be a necessity for it, in vindication of the privileges of an *Englishman*? Unless, with some of the Quakers, you acknowledge it *sinful* to fight at all, you cannot suppose it sinful to fight in support of any of our *just rights*, our unalienable privileges. But should these privileges be irrecoverably lost, and an arbitrary power established, no doubt it must be not only lawful, but it will be *necessary* to submit to that

power, till an auspicious hour arrives in which some hope may dawn upon us of being able once more to recover our liberties. And such a submission as this, is all the submission our Lord's example can be supposed in the least degree to countenance.

How could he avoid paying the tribute demanded of him? The Jews were at this time *tributaries* to the Roman people, and kept in subjection by *Roman* governors, and a *Roman* military power. Our blessed Lord came to establish a kingdom that was *not of this world*, and it was no part therefore of his design either to support or destroy any particular form of civil government. And without doing this, without taking upon him either in an ordinary or extraordinary way to overturn the *Roman power*, how could he avoid paying the tribute in question? But if you would from hence infer it is *unlawful* to fight in support of our *just rights and privileges*, you must suppose it to be equally unlawful to fight *for* government, as when we are oppressed by it, to fight *against* it. The only question on the subject of *resistance* is, whether we resist a *lawful* or an *unlawful* authority: if a *lawful* authority, our resistance is *sinful* in a very high degree; but if it be an *unlawful* authority we resist, our resistance is glorious, though if there be no prospect of success, it may be rash and imprudent, and a quiet submission more eligible.

That you may the more effectually persuade your readers of the orthodoxy of your doctrine, you endeavor to make them believe that it is the *loyal doctrine* of Christ himself, countenanced by his *precept* as well as *example*. The
passage

passage you produce to prove this, is taken from Matt. xxii. 16, &c. *The Herodians said unto him, Master, we know that thou teachest the way of God in truth, &c. Tell me, therefore, what thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Shew me the tribute money. And they brought to him a penny. And he said to them, whose is this image and superscription? They say to him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, render therefore unto Cæsar, the things which are Cæsar's, &c.*—

Our Lord, in this passage, to avoid giving a direct answer to an ensnaring question, calls for a Roman penny, and upon observing that it had Cæsar's image and superscription upon it, tells them that they certainly *might* render, or that it was undoubtedly *lawful* (there was no *sin* in it) to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. But does he say *one word* to determine whether it was *lawful* in Cæsar to usurp dominion over them, and to impose tribute upon them, or whether it would be *unlawful* in them to *resist* this usurped power, should a fair opportunity offer for that purpose? You might as well conclude, that if our Lord had determined that it was *lawful* to give a highwayman our money, (though it would *not be lawful* to give him our *consciences*) that it must therefore be *unlawful* to *resist* a highwayman, or to *refuse* him our money whenever he saw fit to demand it.

Your application of this doctrine to the Colonists is curious indeed. These are your words: "The Colonists ask you, shall we pay to the King and parliament of Great Britain,
taxes

taxes which they have laid upon us without our consent? You answer, Shew me some of your lawful money newly coined, that I may see who rules and protects you now. They bring to you a guinea, with a royal head on one side, and the British arms on the other. You say to them, whose is this image and superscription? They reply, King George's; and they read this motto, *George III. by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, &c.* Now, Rev. Sir, unless you will coin *new money*, together with a *new gospel*, as you regard the word and authority of Jesus Christ, you *are bound* to answer the Colonists as he answered the Herodians: and, in this case, instead of imposing upon them the ANTINOMIAN paradoxes of your letter, and throwing oil upon the flame of revolt, you will say, Render therefore to George the III^d. &c. the things which are HIS."

Such is your argument. But pray, Sir, does all this declamation prove what things are HIS, or that the Americans *are bound* to pay what they conceive no MAN has a right to demand of them without their consent, either expressed by themselves or representatives? Suppose an arbitrary King under his sign manual should send one of his officers to demand of me any sum he thought proper, as a tribute to the support of government? Might he not enforce his demand with all the pompous rhetoric you have made use of upon this occasion? Might he not say, in answer to every objection, Shew me a penny, &c.? And what reply could you consistently make to him? Should you think to get off, by observing that you had only allowed that the King had a right to *reasonable taxes*, and to what

was

was *his due*; your argument vanishes into smoke. The Americans do not dispute the king's right to *reasonable taxes*, and to whatever may be *his due*; but they contend that *it is not reasonable* for the parliament here to judge what they are able or ought to pay, and that no tax laid upon them by the British parliament is the *King's DUE*, any more than any tax laid by the LORDS, upon the commons of Great-Britain, would be *his due*. The only contention is, whether they shall have the giving of their own money, or whether the British parliament shall take upon them to give it for them. In other words, whether they shall be slaves or freemen. We have already the *monopoly* of their trade, from which a great revenue is virtually derived;* and all they desire is, that whatever we want more, they may have the privilege of judging for themselves, whether it be reasonable or not for them to give it; and that you should no more determine for them than they for you. But to prove their unreasonableness in desiring this, and that they had need coin new money, and a new gospel, if they would be gratified in this desire, you think it enough to call for a *guinea*, to ask whose image it bears, and then to tell them that they are to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. I know not how to express my astonishment, that you should be capable of deluding yourself with such mere shadows of argument,

* "Not contented with drawing from them a large revenue *indirectly*, we have endeavored to procure one *directly* by an authoritative seizure; and, in order to gain a pepper-corn in this way, have chosen to hazard millions, acquired by the peaceable intercourse of trade—Vile policy! What a scourge is government so conducted?"

Obs. on lib. p. 69.

ment, whilst you seem purposely to overlook every thing solid and substantial. Might you not apply your reasoning to the Irish, if *they* were to be taxed by our parliament? For though you tell us they have the privilege (in part) of coining their own money, yet I apprehend all their money bears the image and superscription of George the III^d.

But your grand plea from scripture is taken from Romans 13, &c. "*Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.*" Here, you make a break in the apostle's reasoning, but I chuse to insert the whole of it. [*For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.* Then, you take up the apostle's words again. *WHEREFORE ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience-sake. For, for this cause pay you tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, &c.*

Now, sir, I observe, when you recite these passages of scripture, you seem to be aware yourself of the inconvenience of interpreting them in the most absolute manner, and there-
fore

fore hint at some exceptions to that obedience which the apostle enjoins. *Whosoever therefore, (you add, in a parenthesis,) in LAWFUL THINGS resisteth the power; (and then subjoin in another parenthesis,) which PROVIDENCE calls him to obey, resisteth the ordinance of God, and shall receive to himself condemnation.* But unless you had explained to us what you mean by *lawful things*, and how we are to know what power PROVIDENCE calls us to obey, it is not possible to ascertain your meaning.

The *Americans* are very far from thinking that they resist the power in *lawful things*. The very point in debate, is whether it be *lawful*, whether it be agreeable to the fundamental laws and constitution of Great-Britain, for the house of commons here, to tax the unrepresented Americans. You yourself, suppose it possible for the *supreme power* to act *unlawfully*; and, by your limiting our obedience to this power to *lawful things*, you plainly acknowledge, by necessary implication, that *when* the supreme power acts *unlawfully*, it may be *resisted*, without resisting the ordinance of God.

And who is to be the judge in this case? If you answer, the SUPREME POWER; your *limitation* of obedience to that power in *lawful things* is nugatory and means nothing. You cannot suppose a culprit to accuse and condemn himself. On the other hand, if the PEOPLE are to judge when the supreme power acts *unlawfully* towards them, there is an end of the argument. They cannot *resist* the supreme power, without at least supposing themselves *oppressed* by it. So that from your own concessions, either expressed or implied, the supreme
power

power may be resisted, in certain possible cases, without resisting the ordinance of God, or incurring damnation.

Should you reply, that by *lawful things* you mean all those things which are *not contrary* to the express law of God: I answer, is there any rapacity, is there any injustice, is there any tyranny but *is contrary* to the express law of God? Is not every member of the British legislature, as much as every American, expressly commanded to love his neighbor as himself; and to do unto his neighbor even as he would have his neighbor do unto him?

Should you still argue, that though it be not lawful for the supreme power to oppress and play the tyrant: yet it *is lawful*, and therefore we ought to *submit* to oppression; I answer, it may be not only lawful but *necessary* to do it, because it may be out of our power, (at least without bringing upon ourselves a greater evil than that which we would avoid,) to do otherwise. There may be cases in which it may be highly *prudent* to let a man that has *taken away our coat* unjustly, *take our cloke also**, rather than contend with him. But I believe there have been few if any enthusiasts so wild as to suppose, that our Lord's advice upon such an occasion was ever intended as an universal rule, and to be understood as binding upon the conscience upon every occasion without exception. Indeed to suppose it *unlawful* to *resist* a power acting *unlawfully*, whenever it is in our power to resist it effectually, is to suppose it *LAWFUL* to *countenance* and *encourage* as much as in us lies, what is *UNLAWFUL*.

That

* Luke vi. 29.

That the great God designed man for a state of society, that no society can subsist without government, no government without subordination and MAGISTRACY; is most readily granted. Consequently, that magistracy is the ORDINANCE OF GOD, and ought most religiously to be submitted to for *conscience-sake*. Those therefore that *refuse to obey lawful magistrates, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities* as such, must be considered by all sober religious people as the pests of society, and the common enemies of mankind.—And *these* were the very people the apostle had in view, when he enjoined in the manner he does, submission to the higher powers.

Full of pride and conceit, these people imagined, that now they had assumed the *profession* of Christianity, they were too great and important to be subject to the dominion of Heathen magistrates, if to any at all. Now in opposition to such destructive notions, the apostle lets them know that they were bound to *submit to the higher powers, not only for wrath but conscience-sake*. Not only from a fear of punishment, but from a principle of duty to God. *Whosoever resisteth the power*, says the apostle, (that is, as you very properly observe, in *lawful things*) *resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation*, that is, shall be condemned and punished for their resistance. The apostle then sets before them the grounds and reasons of that submission to magistracy which he had enjoined upon them. *For rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil: the ministers of God to thee FOR GOOD. WHEREFORE* (the connection of the apostle's reason-

F

ing

ing is admirable,) *ye must needs be subject. For this cause pay you tribute also,* (i. e. hence appears the reasonableness of your paying tribute) *for they are GOD's ministers,* (q. d. though they are but men, and appointed to their office by men, and supported in it by men; yet when legally invested with authority, they are to be considered as clothed with the authority of GOD himself the supreme ruler; and acting as his vicegerents, for and under him, whose sovereign authority it is, that they *should* exercise such governing power as the nature of the government they are entrusted to administer admits of, and be considered in this view, as his ministers *for good*, and be supported accordingly, as) *attending continually upon this very thing.* As they are appointed to the management of the weighty business of government, and actually devote themselves to this business, whilst private individuals are at leisure to pursue their own more immediate business, it is but reasonable that we should all contribute towards the necessary support of this government, established, implicitly at least, by *general consent*, designed to promote the *general good*; and which has, consequently, the special sanction of GOD. *Render therefore to all THEIR DUES;* whatever according to the constitution under which you live, may appear to be *the dues* of your rulers, or of those who are entrusted with the executive part of government, cheerfully pay it. Do not foolishly think, that you are exempted on account of your religious profession and character, but as good members of society, as friends of order and good government, for *conscience's sake*, or in obedience to the supreme authority

of God, whose will it is that you should obey and pay tribute to your lawful magistrates,—*render tribute TO WHOM TRIBUTE IS DUE, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear.* The apostle does not take upon him, in the least, to determine *to whom* tribute was due, or what *quantum* of tribute might be due, but only enjoins the conscientious payment of what was due, to those to whom it was due, according to the nature of the government under which they lived. Doctrine this, which I believe no sober Christian will pretend to object to, but be most cordially ready to receive it as worthy of all acceptance.

But would you from these general injunctions of obedience to magistrates, as the powers that are *ordained of God*, (*for good*, remember,) infer the duty of *absolute submission*, or of *non-resistance* and *passive obedience*, to *whatever* the supreme power may require of us? Would you from hence infer that the British parliament have a right to tax the Americans, and are acting *lawfully* or constitutionally in doing it, and may not therefore be resisted? You evidently *mean* to infer all this. But the premises, sir, are much too narrow, to support so wide-spreading a conclusion.

Before you can fairly support an inference of this magnitude, you must prove that the PRESENT FORM of government in Great-Britain, is the IMMEDIATE and SPECIAL *ordinance of God*; and that taxing the unrepresented Americans is perfectly CONSONANT to this form of government. And how are you to prove this? I know of no passage of scripture it is possible for you to pervert in favor of so extraordinary a position,

position, unless it be the assertion of the apostle, that *there is no power but of God*, and that the POWERS THAT BE, *are ordained of God*.

But how will this answer your purpose? *There is no power but of God*. EVERY CIVIL POWER established for the *good of society*, is of God. It exists by his providence, and whilst acting *lawfully*, may plead not merely the sanction of those by whom it was immediately formed, but the sanction of God himself, who approves of the exercise of such a power*. *The powers that BE* therefore, says the apostle, those who have now the executive power in their hands, by whomsoever that power might be first committed to them, are to be considered as *ordained of God*; and so far as they act *lawfully*, as the *ministers of God for good*, they are equally to be submitted to, as though they acted by an immediate special commission from God, under the broad seal of heaven.

The *powers that be* in Great-Britain, the *supreme power* residing in King, Lords and Commons, (in the formation of which power, it will not, I presume, be pretended the PEOPLE had no share,) we readily allow ought to be submitted to whilst acting *lawfully*, as though they were in an *immediate and extraordinary manner ordained of God*.

We are accordingly exhorted by the apostle Peter, 1 Pet. ii. 13. *to submit ourselves to every*

ORDINANCE

* There is a beautiful passage of Cicero's to this purpose, quoted by the Pennsylvania Farmer, in his Essay, p. 11. *Nothing is more agreeable to the supreme Deity, that governs this universe, than civil societies lawfully established* — *Nihil est illi principi Deo, qui omnem hunc mundum regit, quod quidem in terris fieri iustius, quam consilia cætusque hominum jure sociati, quæ civitates ædificantur.* Somn. Scip. c. 3.

ORDINANCE OF MAN for the *Lord's sake*; whether it be to the *King as supreme*, or unto inferior magistrates sent by him. Now in this passage, government itself, with respect to the particular form of it, as well as with respect to the specific laws enacted by it, is considered as the ordinance of MAN, and submission to the *King as supreme*, as well as to inferior magistrates appointed by and under him, is represented as submission to the ordinance of man. This submission is however enjoined upon us for the *Lord's sake*; because it is the will of God, (see v. 15.) that we should submit to lawful authority, as being not merely the ordinance of man, but ultimately as the apostle Paul very properly styles it, the ordinance of God—FOR GOD. The power of the prince, as much as the power of the lowest officers appointed by him, is immediately the ordinance of man. But in the lawful discharge of the trust committed to them, the power even of the lowest officer appointed by the prince, as well as the power of the prince himself is of God; and a resistance therefore of a petty constable in the lawful execution of his office is a resistance of the ordinance of God, as much as resisting the prince himself.

But will this prove, that the powers that be, are really acting lawfully in laying a tax upon their unrepresented brethren in America? That they are ordained of God to exercise a power that was never entrusted to them? A power, which those over whom they are desirous of exercising it, judge would be for their destruction, not for their good? The destruction of that which is infinitely dearer to them than their lives, I mean, their LIBERTIES. Their

religious as well as *civil liberties*. They are not so stupid as not to know, that should an absolute despotic power be once established over their *purses*, they would be in a miserable plight to undertake the defence of their *consciences*. And can you prove from scripture that they *ought*, that they are in *duty bound* passively to submit to such a *destructive* power as this? No, sir, you might as well prove that these same *powers that be*, have a right from scripture, and might *lawfully*, if so they pleased, annihilate the rights of all the electors of Great-Britain, convert our present limited monarchy into an absolute tyranny, and this garden of LIBERTY, into the howling wilderness of despotism and horror.

Every *good government* is of God. Nor will the personal vices of our governors, nor any slight errors in their administration of government, justify our resisting them. But if *the powers that be*, should attempt to be what they have no authority, either from God or man to be; to be, not the ministers of God *for good*, but ministers of the prince of darkness *for evil*, the very *same reason* binds us to a *resistance* of them, as would otherwise engage us for *conscience-sake* to obey them.

We are here very naturally led to consider that grand question, concerning the *origin of power*; is the power of governors FROM GOD, OR THE PEOPLE? You answer, from God. And it is granted that ALL POWER must be ultimately from him, because it is in him we all live and move and have our being. But the real question is, whether it be *immediately* from God, or from the people? If *immediately* from
God;

God; I call upon you to produce the CHARTER by which he hath ordained that particular form of government which is established in *Great Britain*, and according to which even *pot-boulers* in some boroughs have a voice in the legislative body. To establish the privileges of our *pot-wallopers*, as they are called, by a *jure divino*, will be a great exploit indeed! When you have done this, please to point out the particular place in this *heaven-descended charter*, which authorizes the taxation of the unrepresented Americans. The *Pennsylvanian* charter you know, Sir, understand it how you please, was the charter of *man*, not of God.—The next favor I have to beg of you is, as you are a *Swiss* by birth, that you would shew me the charter from heaven, ordaining the *aristocratical* government which prevails in some of the *Swiss-Cantons*, and the *King Mobship*, the absolutely *democratical* government which is established in others. In short, Sir, I beg you to favor the world with a copy of *all* those extraordinary charters, by which the several infinitely diversified forms of government which prevail in different parts of the world, are established JURE DIVINO.

And it will be necessary you should then inform us whether these *divine charters* allow the supreme power to rule *only* according to the several forms of government *now settled*, or whether they impart also to the several powers that be, a *discretionary absolute power* to ALTER the form of government, when they please, and to mould it according to their own fancies. Whether they authorize the powers that be, to rule with the sceptre of *righteousness* only, or
also

also exchange it, whenever they think proper, for the IRON ROD OF OPPRESSION.

But till these charters are produced and duly authenticated, I shall take the liberty of considering every *particular form* of government, and consequently the nature and extent of the power entrusted to those who have the management of it, as derived, *under God*,* immediately from the PEOPLE, and that to the people they are therefore accountable for any breach of their TRUST; and that as they have no power whatever but what the PEOPLE directly or indirectly gave them, the people are consequently no longer bound to submit to their power, than whilst it is exercised *lawfully*, or in such a manner,

* “ If legislative, royal power, say you, p. 44, ascended from the people, the Lord would not have elected Moses to be the Lawgiver, and Joshua to be the Leader of Israel, without first consulting the tribes. Nor would he have raised them judges afterwards, without previously asking their consent. Much less would he have anointed Saul, David, Jehu, and others, to be kings over Israel, in so arbitrary a manner as he did. To prove your doctrine *therefore*, you must appeal to the right exercised by some *lawless* citizens, who unjustly hated their Sovereign, and said, *we will not have this man to reign over us*, Luke xix. 14, &c.”

But what can be the meaning of all this empty parade?—Does any one dispute the right God has to make whom he pleases, King? Let any Sovereign prove himself *divinely appointed* to the Sovereignty, and we will not dispute his right to the passive obedience of his subjects. But *hereditary right*, seems very poorly supported indeed by the examples you have adduced, since *Saul* was made King during the life of his father, and *David* raised to the throne in preference to his elder brethren.—And yet, because this nonsensical notion of hereditary indefeasible right is not permitted to bear down before it common sense and common honesty, we are to be abused as the abettors of a “*Theudas, a Barrabbas, a Caiaphas*,” and held up to the world as the successors of those lawless citizens, who would not have their *lawful* Sovereign to rule over them!—But the “*Calm Address*,” (*per fas perque nefas*) must be *sanctified*!

ner, and, upon the whole, for those purposes of *general good*, for which this power was first given them.*

I will illustrate the matter by one of your
OWN

* "I am sensible, that all I have been saying, would be very absurd, were the opinions just which some have maintained concerning the origin of government. According to these opinions, government is not the creature of the people, or the result of a convention between them and their rulers: but there are certain men who possess in themselves, independently of the will of the people, a right of governing them, which they derive from the Deity. This doctrine has been abundantly refuted by many excellent writers. (See among others Mr. *Locke* on government, and Dr. *Priestley's* essay on the first principles of government.) It is a doctrine which avowedly subverts civil liberty; and which represents mankind as a body of vassals, formed to descend like cattle from one set of owners to another, who have an absolute dominion over them. It is a wonder, that those who view their species in a light so humiliating, shou'd ever be able to think of themselves without regret and shame."—— In considering this subject, it is unavoidable to reflect on the excellency of a free government, and its tendency to exalt the nature of man.—Every member of a free state, having his property secure, and knowing himself his own governor, possesses a consciousness of dignity in himself, and feels incitements to emulation and improvement, to which the miserable slaves of arbitrary power must be utter strangers. In such a state all the springs of action have room to operate, and the mind is stimulated to the noblest exertions. (See Dr. *Priestley* on government, p. 68, 69, &c.)—But to be obliged, from our birth, to look up to a creature no better than ourselves as the master of our fortunes; and to receive his will as our law.—What can be more humiliating? What elevated ideas can enter a mind in such a situation?—Agreeably to this remark, the subjects of free states have, in all ages, been most distinguished for genius and knowledge. LIBERTY is the soil where the arts and sciences have flourished, and the more free a state has been, the more have the powers of the human mind been drawn forth into action, and the greater number of brave men has it produced. With what lustre do the ancient free states of *Greece* shine in the annals of the world? How different is that country now, under the Great Turk? The difference between a country inhabited by men, and by brutes, is not greater.

Observations on Liberty, &c. p. 16, 17, 18.

own similes. An apprentice binds himself, say to a *merchant*, under certain mutual covenants and stipulations. That an apprentice should submit in *lawful* things, to the authority of his master, for *conscience sake*, as a part of that obedience he owes to the supreme governor, who hath *ordained* that *servants should be obedient to their masters in all things*; no one will dispute. But suppose the merchant, his master, instead of fulfilling the covenants into which he had entered with his apprentice, violates every one of them, treats him as his groom or coachman, instead of admitting him into his counting-house and instructing him in mercantile affairs:—will the apprentice be bound to obedience? If he *resisteth* the power, and refuses to comply with it, will any one charge him with resisting the ordinance of God, and exposing himself to damnation?

In like manner, every civil government under heaven, unless it be established by a *divine charter*, must be founded upon MUTUAL COMPACTS betwixt the prince and the people, the governors and the governed. There is *no medium*. Either the supreme power, under every particular form of government in which it subsists, is *immediately from God*, or it is *immediately, under God, from the people*. If *immediately from God*, shew us the CHARTER establishing it. If *from the people*, let us know what authority the governors have to go *beyond* the power entrusted to them, more than the people have to *refuse obedience* to them in the exercise of that power with which they are legally invested. What authority the governors have

have to *oppress*, more than the people have to *rebel*.

The constitution under which we live, it is well known is a *limited monarchy*. The King as first magistrate has *his prerogatives*; the nobles have *their prerogatives*; and the people have *theirs*. Now, Sir, what right has the first magistrate to his peculiar prerogatives, more than the nobles and the people have to theirs? What right has the King to invade the prerogatives of the nobility, more than the nobility to invade the prerogatives of the King; or what right have either King or nobility to invade the prerogatives of the people, even of the pot-boilers, more than the people have to invade theirs?

Perhaps you will say, The SUPREME POWER in every government, must be lodged somewhere, and this power must be OMNIPOTENT and UNCONTROLLABLE. I allow it. But the glory of the British constitution is, that the PEOPLE have never parted with this power, but have most religiously kept it in their own hands. You will tell me, probably, that they *do part with it*, when they elect representatives, and that the *supreme power* in Great Britain, most unquestionably resides in King, Lords, and Commons,

I answer, such a portion of it only as is within the limits of the fundamental laws and constitution of the kingdom. To suppose the contrary, is to suppose the people send up their representatives to parliament, not to preserve but betray their privileges, not to serve, but to ruin and destroy them.

Should a bill pass both houses of parliament,
and

and receive the royal assent, (and it would then have the fullest FORM of law,) enacting that for the future the King should be ABSOLUTE,* and that the houses of Lords and Commons should no longer retain a place in the legislature: would this be LAW? Would this be binding upon the conscience of an Englishman? You might as well suppose, that if a TRUSTEE was to give away an estate which was entrusted to his management for the benefit of orphan children who were unable to manage it themselves, the estate would not be recoverable, nor such a villain punishable: but that his act in giving away the estate ought to be tamely submitted to for *conscience-sake*, because he was *trustee* for these children, impowered therefore to act for them, and might perhaps out of the abundance of his hypocrisy plead, that *he thought* it would be BETTER for the children to be without the estate than with it, since the SCRIPTURE says, *how hardly shall they that have riches, enter into the kingdom of heaven*. When the people are so besotted as to submit to such doctrine as this, I give you leave to call them as you have done, BEASTS†, for they will forfeit all claim to the character of *rationalists*‡.

Before

* “Canada, according to the late extension of it’s limits, is a country almost as large as half EUROPE; and it may possibly come in time to be filled with British subjects. The Quebec bill makes the King of Great-Britain a despot over all that country.” — Obs. p. 46.

Cannot the omnipotence of parliament establish despotism here, as well as there?—And yet there are those who will have it, that all the measures of ministry respecting America, are strictly *constitutional*: One cannot help continually recurring to the old adage—“*Quos Deus, vult perdere, prius DEMENTAT*.”

† So spake the non-juring Parson, Lestie, in days of yore: so speaks the vicar of Madeley, a republican by birth, now.

‡ “Government is, in the very nature of it, a TRUST; and

Before you can establish the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, you must prove from scripture, that ABSOLUTE POWER, that is TYRANNY, is conferred upon all those in every kingdom who have the government in their hands, by an immediate grant from God. That power is not communicated from God to the people, and from the people to the prince, whereby he becomes *singulis major*, greater than any one of his subjects; but that, *independently* of them, he is *universis major*, superior to them all, "and receiveth his power so immediately from God, as that there is no recipient between God and him to convey it to him," and consequently, that he is in no respect accountable to the people for the use or abuse of his power, but that they, like

G tame

all its powers a DELEGATION for gaining particular ends. This *trust* may be misapplied and abused. It may be employed to defeat the very ends for which it was instituted; and to subvert the very rights which it sought to protect.—A PARLIAMENT, for instance, consisting of a body of representatives, chosen for a limited period, to make laws, and to grant money for public services, would forfeit its authority by making itself perpetual, or even prolonging its own duration; by nominating its own members; by accepting bribes; or subjecting itself to any kind of foreign influence. This would convert a *Parliament* into a *conclave* or *junta* of self-created tools; and a state that has lost its regard to its own rights, so far as to submit to such a breach of trust in its rulers, is enslaved.—Nothing, therefore, can be more absurd than the doctrine which some have taught, with respect to the OMNIPOTENCE of parliaments. They possess no power beyond the limits of the trust for the execution of which they were formed. If they contradict this trust, they betray their constituents, and dissolve themselves. All delegated power must be subordinate and limited.—If OMNIPOTENCE can, with any sense, be ascribed to a legislature, it must be lodged where all legislative authority originates; that is, in the PEOPLE. For *the* *r* takes government is instituted; and their's is the only real omnipotence!"

Obs. &c. p. 15, 16.

same beasts indeed, are obliged to submit to his pleasure, he being accountable to none but God.

Now, sir, I readily allow, that you have clearly proved this was the opinion of Mr. Baxter : as you have also, that it was his sentiment, that if the parliament had any legislative power, (which seems to have been matter of *doubt* with him,) it could not be as they were *the body of the people*, but only as the government *twisteth* them, (he does not tell us, nor do you for him, how they were twisted,) into the government : and finally, that he thought, to affirm the contrary was to *overthrow all government*.

Mr. Baxter, sir, was a very great, and, I firmly believe, a very good man. But—*humanum est errare*, and, I fear, this is not the only error this great and good man fell into. Though he had sorely smarted under the rod of persecution, (strange to tell!) he was no friend to an impartial, equal toleration. But are we arguing about what were or were not the opinions of Mr. Baxter ? You tell me, you believe I cannot prove him to be wrong : but is it my business to prove a *negative* ? The question is, what have you advanced in your letters to me, or what has he advanced in your quotations from him, to prove that he was right ?

“ *Reason*, (you say, p. 42.) *informs you, that the first man was endued with a power to protect and rule mankind*. Now reason informs me, that he could have no power to protect and rule mankind, till there were some for him to rule. And when he became a husband, reason informs me he had as much power as any other husband to protect and rule his wife : and when he be-

came

came a father, he had as much power as any other father to protect and rule his children. My reason further informs me, that EVE also, when she became a mother, had as much power as any other mother. And by the way, pray, sir, why did you not mention *Eve*, the *first woman*, as well as *Adam* the *first man*? Is not *Eve's motherhood*, as necessary to support the titles of our *Queens*, as *Adam's fatherhood* that of our *Kings*? Mr. W. and you too can talk slipperily enough about maids and widows, and all the women in England, when you think it will serve your turn: but upon the present occasion, even *Eve* herself, the mother of all living, escapes your notice; and, aggrandised as her husband is as the *monarch of the earth*, she has not the compliment paid her which might be thought due to a lady of the bed-chamber! The fifth commandment however says, not only honor thy *father*, but also, and *THY MOTHER*; so that, upon your plan of arguing, we have as good a sanction for what, in vulgar phrase, is styled *petticoat government*, as for any other.

But the next thing reason informs you of is, "that all men are born in a state of civil society," which you very curiously prove thus;—"because no child was ever his own father, or his own mother, his own nurse, or his own protector." That is to say, because all men are born, therefore they are born in a state of civil society, or in a state of subjection to their parents, and to the society to which they belong. And then further, because they must necessarily have been *born* in this state of subjection, therefore they must necessarily *always* continue in this

state. In other words, because they certainly were once children, therefore they must always be children.* Because they were once nursed and protected, therefore they must always be so. Because it was once necessary, that their parents, their nurses, or guardians, should chuse for them, therefore it is necessary they should always do so, and that they should never chuse for themselves. From all which it follows, you observe, of consequence, that *all mankind*, his remote as well as immediate descendents, "*were under as strong an obligation of submitting to the first man, (in all things agreeable to God's supreme dominion,) as the first man was of submitting to God.*" And that if Adam had not sinned and died, to this day he would be, under God, the monarch of all the earth, and all **KINGS** would

* To prove the right Great-Britain has to tax America, it is very common to plead, we are the **PARENT STATE**. Hear *Dr. Price*, upon this subject.

"These are the magic words which have fascinated and misled us.—The English came from *Germany*. Does that give the *German* states a right to tax us?—Children, having no property, and being incapable of guarding themselves, the author of nature has committed the care of them to their parents, and subjected them to their absolute authority. But there is a period when, having acquired property, and a capacity of judging for themselves, they become independent agents; and when, for this reason, the authority of their parents ceases, and becomes nothing, but the respect and influence due to benefactors. Supposing, therefore, that the order of nature in establishing the relation between parents and children, ought to have been the rule of our conduct to the colonies, we should have been gradually relaxing our authority as they grew up. But, like mad parents, we have done the contrary; and, at the very time when our authority should have been most relaxed, we have carried it to the greatest extent, and exercised it with the greatest rigour. No wonder then, that they have turned upon us; and obliged us to remember, that they are not children." —*Obs. on liberty.* &c. p. 37.

would be bound to acknowledge his supreme authority.

All *Kings*, sir! I thought you was proving the *Kingship* of Adam; and, all at once, without giving me the least previous notice of the honor you intended me, instead of proving *Adam's* Kingship, you introduce me to I know not how many other Kings, and then tell me, that if *Adam* had lived, He would have been the supreme King over them all. But whence was the Kingship of these lower petty Kings to be derived? From the special grant of *Adam*, or the special grant of God? And who were entitled to the honor of this Kingship? Were *all* the descendants of *Adam* entitled to it; or only those of them who attained to the dignity of *fatherhood*? And I would further ask, whether you do not extend the honor of the *Queenship* to all the good women who have attained to the dignity of *motherhood*? But as you say nothing that tends to furnish an answer to these questions, we must be content to remain in the profoundest ignorance of your sentiments concerning them.

You affirm, however, that *Adam* received his DIVINE RIGHT of dominion from God. And does not every father receive the *same* divine right of dominion? The fifth commandment "Honor thy father and thy mother," you will allow, Sir, came *immediately* from God. And what divine right of parental dominion, whatever that be, was ever communicated to *Adam* and *Eve*, which this commandment does not communicate to every father and mother in the world? There is nothing to be inferred from

the parental authority of *Adam*, but is equally applicable to all parents without exception.

But supposing you had proved, what it is absolutely out of any one's power to prove, that *Adam* was invested by God with ABSOLUTE REGAL authority over ALL his descendants:—what then? Why, you tell us, that “*Adam at his death left it*, (that is, this regal authority,) *behind him*; and even BEFORE his death, (how this came about you have not told us,) *it began to subdivide itself into every branch of family government and NATIONAL administration.*” And HENCE it is, you observe with your usual logical accuracy, that *the powers that be*, are said to be *ordained of God*, and that magistrates are called *gods* in the old and new testament.

Well, Sir, you have cut yourself a short way to your conclusion, but of what use will it be to you, now you are come to it? It is a two-edged weapon, it cuts on both sides.—Suppose you had lived in the times of the usurpation of *Oliver Cromwell*; would not your argument have demonstrated his DIVINE RIGHT to the protectorship? *Adam* received, you say, his *divine right* of dominion from God; when he died he left it behind him; and HENCE it appears, that *the powers that are*, i. e. *Oliver* and his rump parliament, who somehow or other picked up a scrap of that power *Adam* left behind him, are *ordained of God*, and ought not to be resisted. You would have made an excellent court chaplain to the protector! In like manner, might not *Ket* the tanner, you speak of, when he assumed the power of judicature under the oak of reformation, (had it not been for that

unlucky

unlucky logic to him, of arguing from might to right,) have pleaded *divine right*, since *Adam* had supreme power from God, and when he died left it behind him. *Jack Cade*, *Wat Tyler*, and even *John of Leyden*, might also have adopted your argument. And I defy you to prove that they might not have used it in support of their mad pretensions, with as good a grace as it is made use of by you. Nay, Sir, the American Congress itself might make use of it to as much advantage as any other power in the world.

Before your argument in favor of passive obedience and non-resistance can operate as you would have it, and be secured from proving a source of endless confusion and disorder in society, you must tell us who is *Adam's* HEIR. What does it signify what power *Adam* had, or what power he left behind him to his successors; unless we *certainly know* who those successors are.

If the mere *possession* of the supreme power is to be deemed a sufficient title to the character of *Adam's* heir, then whoever can get at this power, whether he gets it by secret assassinations or open violences, or however he gets it, is to be considered as having an undoubted *divine right* to it, as a successor and presumptive heir to *Adam*.

You tell us indeed yourself, that an ambitious man *may* procure an *unlawful* coronation. But what you mean by an *unlawful* coronation, you have left us to conjecture. You have not said one word tending to explain your meaning. Nor do I see, upon your principles, what propriety there is in calling any coronation *unlawful*,

ful, unless you could prove that the person crowned was not the *right heir* of *Adam*, and could point out the person that was so, to whose prejudice this usurper had obtained a coronation.

In the magnitude of your condescension, you further allow, that in *lawful* coronations, the Lord may invite *the people to fall in* with his providential choice: yea, and more than all this, that he sometimes brings about *his choice* by *means of the people*: but, that this does not deprive him of his prerogative. But what you mean by a *lawful* coronation, whether the coronation of *Adam's right heir*, or of any person you may think proper presumptively to suppose so; and how we are to know when it is the *choice of God* that is brought about by *means of the people*: you have not explained to us.

Were we therefore to allow all you have advanced concerning the kingship of *Adam*, and the rights of his successors, to be conclusive; what would it avail to the establishment of any one kingdom in the world, unless the reigning monarch could be proved to be the *lawful direct heir* of *Adam*? But what prince is there so weak, as to rest his pretensions to sovereignty upon such a foundation? And yet, Sir, unless this *heirship* could be proved, every crown and kingdom in the world lies open, upon your principles, to the ambition of any man or set of men who may have courage and strength to seize them. And if they succeed in their enterprize, you hold out as good a title to them, as the unfortunate princes had who are deprived of their crowns and kingdoms by them.

Suppose

Suppose a *Ket* the tanner, a *Jack Cade*, or a *Wat Tyler* were to rise up and seize the reins of government here. How could you, Sir, upon your principles, when their power was once established, *resist* or *refuse* to obey them? Could not either or all of them bring as good proof that they were the *right heirs* of *Adam*, as the proudest despot upon the globe? And how are you to determine whether this usurped power, was not the power *which providence called you to obey*?

But on the other hand, Sir, my principles would constrain me to pour out my heart's blood in defence of the royal crown and dignity of *George the Third*; whom I reverence from my inmost soul as my *lawful Sovereign*; who has sworn to govern me *according to law*; and was elevated to the throne of these kingdoms, that he might be a *guardian angel* to our fundamental laws and liberties, the *Father* of a *free people*, and the friend of all mankind. Sir, I will venture to say, that as I have always desired to *fear God*, so I *honor the King* in my heart, with that sincerity and honest fervor, which it is impossible in the very nature of things, any *Tory* or *Jacobite*, any one who espouses the principles for which you plead, should experience. * I do not found my regard to the King upon

* I should be glad to know what *authority* you and other ministerial writers have for your *confident assertions* of the prevalence of a high *republican* spirit in this kingdom? Have you, or Mr. *Wesley*, any *proof* of this charge? Or is Mr. W.'s *declaration*, that the friends of American liberty, (and Mr. W. remember, Sir, was one of them very lately,) are all *King-haters*, to be considered as a *demonstration* of the point?—I am, I assure you, Sir, a stranger to these King-haters, these republicans, and know of no people who are so zealously attached to the

upon the tottering base of a supposed hereditary indefeasible right from Adam; a right, which may be claimed by any one, and can be proved by no one: but I found it upon my regard to God, whose *ordinance* it most certainly is that there *should* be civil government in every community; and upon my profound veneration for that particular form of government, which, by the wisdom and bravery of my ancestors, aided by that benign providence which hath ever seconded the virtuous efforts of a free people,—hath long been established in these realms. A form of government, which is at once the envy and admiration of the whole world. A constitution so admirably constructed with respect to its grand principles, that, like a well framed building, every part contributes to the strength and beauty of the whole; nor can a single pin be removed, without deforming, if not endangering, the superb, I had almost said, the divine edifice.

How then, Sir, can I give vent to my astonishment, that under the specious pretence of zeal for this very constitution, and duty to the King at the head of it, you should advance long-explored doctrines, which, if true, would overturn the constitution from its deepest foundations, and drive the King from his throne? The very doctrines which countenance the unrenounced

LIMITED MONARCHY established by the constitution in this kingdom, as the *Whigs*, the friends of American liberty.—If there are any *King-haters* in Great Britain, they are to be found amongst the *high-church jure-divino Jacobites*. For upon their principles, I cannot see how it is possible for them to love, one whom they must consider as an *usurper* of another's undoubted, divine, hereditary, indefeasible right,

renounced claims of a popish pretender; and which, but a few years ago comparatively, actually armed "that heedless vagrant, with his ruffian host of mountain robbers," and inspired him with the infernal hope, of once more reducing this happy land, to all the unutterable horrors of popery and slavery. Doctrines, which, if true, condemn the happy revolution under the immortal King *William*, as a most daring, though successful, invasion of the prerogative of GOD, and of the *unalienable rights* of a *divinely anointed* tyrant. Doctrines, which, if enforced, would restore the servile offspring of this miserable fugitive, to the rights and robes of royalty, and banish from us the present reigning family, for ever. Doctrines, which would advance the STUARTS upon the ruins of the race of BRUNSWICK. Doctrines, which have been solemnly impeached by all the Commons of England in parliament assembled: solemnly condemned by the very Bishops themselves, and the whole house of Peers: in a word, doctrines, which have long since received their death's wound in the writings of a LOCKE, a HOADLEY, and other worthies; and which every true friend of his King and country, might have hoped were buried to arise no more.—I bear you record, Sir, that you have a zeal, but I leave the public to judge, whether it be according to knowledge.

You call the *patriots*, the *opposers* of these doctrines, *Antinomian* patriots. But, might I use the language of the great apostle *Paul*, when he was charged with *antinomianism*.* I would
boldly

* The word *Antinomian*, I would here observe for the sake of those who may not be acquainted with so strange a term in

boldly reply, with indignation at so infamous a charge—*Do we make void the law*, by affirming that taxation and representation are inseparable? Nay, but we *establish the law*: that law, which is the very foundation of our happy government, and which whoever knowingly violates is a *traitor* to his King and country.

Your telling the world I am a Calvinist, and then giving your own horrid and fanciful description of calvinism: and that I am an *Anabaptist*, and then presenting your readers with the most frightful picture of this sect;—is such a display of illiberality, meanness and impertinence, as would most exceedingly well have become a *Thomas Olivers*, but to which I should have thought a Mr. *Fletcher* must have been superior.

I am a Calvinist. But in the name of common sense what has this to do with my dispute about Mr. W. or about his *Calm Address*? If you, Sir, or the public, wish to be acquainted with my religious tenets, I refer you to my *confession of faith* published by Mr. *Buckland* in 1767, and to an *Address to serious Christians*, published in 1773, in answer to Dr. *Priestley's Appeal*;

politics, is intended to describe one that is *against the law*. The Calvinists believe that *by the deeds of the law no flesh living can be justified*, but that men are justified *by grace alone, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*, and they are therefore misrepresented sometimes as being in every respect *against the law*, though they are as zealous, in principle and practice, *for the law*, as a *rule of life*, and the only true standard of *moral and religious character*, as their greatest opposers. The Calvinists are no more Antinomians in religion, than the patriots are in politics.—But Mr. *Fletcher* seems to be no stranger to the surprizing efficacy of the argument, *ab invidia ducto*.

Appeal; in which publications I have very candidly represented and fully vindicated my sentiments. Nor have I, that I know of, the least objection to those articles of the French reformer, upon the subject of *obedience to magistrates*, which you are so kind as to *translate* for me. Whilst it is acknowledged, that every particular form of government is the ordinance of man, I am very ready to acknowledge that if the great end of government, the *salus populi*, is answered, it ought to be submitted to for the *Lord's sake*. Civil government is the ordinance of God for good, and the magistrates by whom it is administered may be considered therefore as his *ministers*, or *lieutenants*, if you like that word better, appointed by him, through the medium of the government they are empowered to administer, to be a terror to evil doers, but a praise to them that do well.

Having given you, Sir, an account of my calvinism, I proceed next to answer your charge of being also an *Anabaptist*. And, standing as I now do in your confessional, Sir, without wrangling about the word, I acknowledge I am what you mean by an *Anabaptist*. But what relation my being a Calvinist, or a Baptist, has to the subject of my dispute with you, I am yet to learn. There are too many Calvinists and Baptists, some in the very society I serve, and several Baptist ministers with whom I am personally acquainted, who, through a mistaken view, as it appears to me, of our happy constitution and of the true meaning of the scriptures, contend earnestly for those very sentiments which you so strenuously defend. And with respect to the *Americans*, if

H

you

you apply to the late Governor *Bernard* or Governor *Hutchinson*, they can inform you, from the best authority, that no one sect, in the *Massachusetts* colony particularly, have discovered so great a disposition to acquiesce in the measures of the ministry, as the Baptists. And yet these are the people, notwithstanding the distinction your own historian had taught you to make betwixt some of this sect, and others,—these are the people concerning whom, at large, you address to me your “*deep question*,” and in whose face you spit all your venom. So that you have, inadvertently, whilst shooting your pointless arrows at *Americanus*, for having dared to attack *your friend* Mr. W. given the deepest wounds to some of your own and the ministry's best friends.—I wish it may cure them of keeping such company.

Many of the Anabaptists of the last century you speak of, were, it is readily acknowledged, bad folks. I have as indifferent an opinion of them as you can have yourself. They were a set of enthusiastic, wrong-headed people. But they were not the *only* enthusiasts of that day, nor were they ever a *leading* party in our public affairs. And it is remarkable that the Baptists who are described by Bishop *Burnet* as men of fierce and barbarous tempers, were *not Calvinists*, but as great enemies to calvinism as Mr. *Fletcher* or Mr. *John Wesley*. The German Baptists, and a great number of the English Baptists, are to this day very far from being Calvinists. Or if they were; why should you not have been ready to suppose the present Baptists were some of “*the gentle, moderate Baptists*” your historian speaks of? Why must they

they be all represented, at least all of them who embrace the political sentiments of *Americanus*, as fierce, dangerous people?—Pray, Sir, were the House of Commons that impeached Dr. *Sacheverel*, the House of Lords that condemned him, and the Bishop of *Salisbury* himself*, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of Norwich, and the learned counsel employed upon that occasion, who all concurred in his condemnation for preaching those very doctrines for which you plead, and in the most masterly speeches justified that condemnation, upon the principles of the constitution, and from the word of God :—were these, and an innumerable tribe of other patriots,—*Anabaptists*, *Calvinists*, or *Antinomians*? And yet the production of a single Letter upon the subject of constitutional liberty, from one whom you thought you could render odious to the world by representing him as a Calvinist and an Anabaptist, is deemed a sufficient reason for your dressing up the most frightful caricature of all the Calvinists and Baptists, and then throwing out shrewd hints that they are, very probably, combining together to *overturn* both church and state. Blush Mr. *Fletcher*, if you have not lost all virtuous sensibility! Blush *Christian charity*, at the secret malice of thy pretended votary! Blush, *humanity* itself!

But after having taken so much pains to exhibit the enormities of a set of people, who happened to agree with *Americanus* in *no one particular*, I suppose, but in their sentiments concerning baptism; how came you to overlook the pretty feats of those *high-church* rioters, who,

H 2

in

* *Burnet*, the historian quoted by Mr. *Fletcher*.

in their attachment to the principles of slavery, most precisely resembled yourself? To say nothing of the dreadful persecutions of *churchmen* in the more *early ages*, by which the ancestors of the present Americans were driven to seek an asylum, in those uncultivated deserts to which they hoped oppression with its iron hand would never have followed them;—I refer you to later times. Did you never hear of the famous Dr. *Henry Sacheverel*, whom I have already mentioned, and the *high-church mobs* which were raised by that *pious* divine throughout the kingdom? Did you never hear of the excellent sport they had in making bonfires of the pulpits and pews they tore down out of a variety of meeting-houses, for their diversion? How, in order to prove their zeal for *non-resistance* to government, they insulted and abused those who were as much under the protection of government as themselves?—And suppose, Sir, I was to put a “*deep question*,” and to ask whether there be not reason to apprehend that the present race of high-churchmen, whether methodists or antimethodists, are as great persecutors in their hearts as their fore-fathers, and are promoting arbitrary power, only that they may by and bye have the command of a limb or two of it to kick and trample upon their dissenting brethren?—Would not this question, think you, be as “*deep*,” and as much to the purpose as your’s, concerning the Calvinists and the Baptists?

Thus, Sir, have I given you a full reply to your officious vindication of Mr. W.’s Calm Address. And if you read it with the same sincerity of heart with which I have written

written it, I think it will carry some degree of conviction to your mind, and lead you to acknowledge that you have erred exceedingly.

Thankful for the blessings of a *free government*, my highest wish is to have those blessings secured to all my fellow-subjects, handed down unimpaired to the remotest posterity, and, were it possible, extended to the whole world. From the purest motives, I most ardently desire and pray for the restoration of peace betwixt us and our colonies. And whether, addressing those who consider themselves the *injured* party, as *rebels*, and resisters of *the ordinance of God*;—or endeavoring to prevail upon those in power, to relax in their demands, to put on gentleness, to treat them with mildness, to reason with, rather than rail at and destroy them;—in short, to address them as *freemen*, and *younger brothers* (to use your own words, *inconsistent* as they are from your pen,)—be the most *probable method* of restoring peace,—I submit to the decision of past experience, and the feelings of every generous mind.

Should you think it necessary to take any public notice of this reply to your vindication of Mr. W. I would previously advertise you, (as I remember in your controversy with Mr. *Hill* you seemed *determined*, at all adventures, to have the *last word*,) that unless you should make use of more sound logic and less delusive rhetoric than you have in your present performance, I shall leave you and your votaries, when you have effectually *hid*

yourself and them in a cloud of words, to the quiet enjoyment of your imaginary triumph. I have too many other more important engagements to attend to, than to be able to waste my time in an endless dispute, with one of the most verbose, and (to use a little *English bluntness*, which I think is as pardonable as *helvetic rudeness*,) I will add, one of the most unmeaning and unfair disputants, that ever took up the polemical gauntlet.

That you may not imagine I speak this through pique or prejudice, Sir, I am very free to declare, that I have a high opinion of your learning, abilities, and piety,—that I have repeatedly heard you, with inexpressible pleasure, in the character of a Christian preacher, and that in the evangelical pursuit of this most divine employment, you have always had, and will ever have, the warmest wishes, of

REV. SIR,

Your humble Servant,

C. E.

POSTSCRIPT

POSTSCRIPT.

The following correspondence, I take the liberty of annexing to the foregoing letters to you, sir, that the public may be enabled to judge whether the *Dean of Gloucester* has been more successful in his vindication of the "*Calm Address*," than the *Vicar of Madely*.

A private letter, from an anonymous writer, sent by post to the Dean of Gloucester, enclosing AMERICANUS's printed letter to Mr. WESLEY.

To the Rev. Doctor JOSIAH TUCKER,
DEAN of GLOUCESTER.

Reverend Sir, Bristol, Oct. 9, 1775.

BEING well assured that you have been greatly pleased with John Wesley's late two-penny piece, addressed to the Americans, and that you speak highly of its merit! at which all who consider you as a man of sense, and the least integrity wonder, as it is a most contemptible performance.—Your mind, if I may judge from your own political writings, seems greatly poisoned. Your prejudices are rank, and your malice inveterate. No doubt you think the notice you have taken of this wonderful production of Mr. W.'s will recommend you to further notice with administration, but believe me every man of sense and honesty must either suppose you a knave and hypocrite, to have shewn such a zeal in recommending

' commending and *distributing* that paltry piece,
 ' or they must suppose you an ass. Very few
 ' look upon you to want abilities (but alas! I
 ' fear they are of the crooked kind.) Your
 ' *heart* is thought to be worse than your head.—
 ' But to the matter in point.—Inclosed is a piece
 ' just published in *reply* to Mr. Wesley's, a seri-
 ' ous and candid perusal of which is recom-
 ' mended to you; and I cannot but think, if
 ' you possess any candour or impartiality, that
 ' it will prove a powerful *emetic*, and cause you
 ' to disgorge Wesley's piece perhaps before well
 ' digested; and if your unaccountable prejudices
 ' and obstinacy are not digestives for the crudest
 ' politics, which favour your own *views*, it is
 ' not improbable it will also serve to bring away
 ' much filthy political poison out of your sto-
 ' mach, and consequently leave you in a more
 ' healthful political habit than you have been
 ' in for a long time past.'

' *I am, Reverend, Sir,*

' *Your most obedient servant,*

' S O U T H.

' P. S. Your heavenly Master taught peace
 ' and good-will unto all men; your earthly one
 ' delights in war, famine, and cruelty. Pray,
 ' Reverend Dean, which of them do you serve
 ' with most zeal? Remember that the good old
 ' book you profess to steer by says, we cannot
 ' serve *two* masters. Nor can we serve God
 ' and *Mammon*. For shame, sir, live up more
 ' to your profession, and good men will respect
 ' you,

' you, otherwise do not wonder at being a proverb to all but bad ones.—Do not lose heaven in search of lawn sleeves, nor betray your country to procure filthy gain.—Adieu.'

The DEAN publishes this letter in the Gloucester Journal, and with it the following answer.

"THE Dean of Gloucester presents his compliments to his kind anonymous correspondent (who, by some of his expressions, seems to be one of the pestle and mortar tribe) with thanks for his physical prescriptions: and in order that the Dean may not be wanting in a return of good offices, he earnestly recommends to this practitioner to take an emetic as soon as he can, also to lose a little blood, to cup and blister, and to live on cool and sparing diet for some time. These with clean straw and a dark room, have been found very useful in the gentleman's disorder. The Dean, without having one favour to ask of the Court or the Ministry, thinks himself very happy, that he lives under the mild, just and legal government of King *George* the Third, and not under the tyrannical, despotic, and usurped sway of a Republican Congress, and of their bigotted, persecuting agents and abettors either on this or on the other side of the Atlantic.

In regard to the treatise, with which the Dean has been honoured on this occasion (tho' the favour would have been still greater, *had it come free of postage*) the Dean begs leave to inform the author, through the means of this *new* correspondent, that when he asserted, there was not a blade of grass in England but what was represented, he was egregiously mistaken; for even freeholders within the boundaries of the city of Gloucester, of Hereford, and of many other places, and in London itself, have no

votes

votes either for town or country. The Dean also further observes, that, in respect to the advice which this author is pleased to give to the non-represented here in England, to remove to some borough town, and there to qualify themselves for voting, by boiling a pot, the author ought to have given this good advice, more particularly, to his friends, the Americans. And then, if they will be pleased to come over, and boil their pots in some of our boroughs, in order to qualify themselves to vote at our elections, they will be as much represented as we are; *and all controversy will be at an end.* But if the Americans should rather chuse to stay at home, than take this trouble, the Dean humbly apprehends they have no right to complain of being not represented; seeing that it is, according to this author's own doctrine, *their own fault.*

" This author says, that the non-represented here in England are secure, that no bad use will be made of their want of representatives, because the Parliament cannot tax them, without also taxing themselves. Granted: but if he and his friends will be consistent, they must say the same of the North-Americans; because if that trade is in any degree so advantageous as they have reported it to be, a British Parliament cannot injure this trade by any mode of taxation, without injuring their own property, in the decay of their manufactures, and the rent of their lands and houses.

" In respect to the independency of Ireland, either the author or the British parliament of 6. G. I. cap. 5. [a Whig King and a Whig Ministry] were mistaken on that head. The same may
be

be said respecting the North-American Colonies; see the 7th and 8th of K. William, cap. 22. § 9. See even the very preamble to Lord Rockingham's act, at which Mr. Burke himself assisted, for repealing the Stamp act; wherein it is asserted, that the British parliament hath a right to make laws to bind the Colonies in all cases whatsoever, or words to that effect.

"However, the Dean is not for sanguinary measures in any case whatever; and therefore *did not authorize his name to be put to the Bristol Address*. His commission was couched in these words, "If the address doth contain a recommendation of *sanguinary, compulsive measures*, I cannot sign it, as being contrary to my system respecting America.—On any other footing I would sign most heartily." The Dean therefore thinks himself obliged to declare, that he *absolutely disapproves of the present measures of Administration*, in sending over troops to subdue the rebels. Whether this declaration is, or is not the likely means to obtain a Bishoprick the world must judge. His scheme is truly pacific in every sense; and indeed it is the only one in which both parties can possibly agree. If the Americans will not submit to those terms, which the English require, as most probably they will not, it is at least equally certain, that the English will never submit to the terms of the Americans, viz. To enjoy all the rights and privileges and protection of Englishmen, and yet be under no obligation to pay any thing for them: therefore the only expedient left is an amicable separation.

"In regard to the distinction, which this author and others have attempted to set up, between
tween

tween the right of taxation and of legislation, it is the silliest and vainest conceit that ever entered the heart of man. For surely, if I have a right to the *money* in my pocket, I have at least an equal right to the *skin* on my back. And therefore, if no man ought to take a piece of the one, without my consent previously given, it is impossible that he can have a greater right to cut away a thong of the other: therefore the right of taxation over America, and the *pains* and *penalties* contained in the Navigation-Act, and other laws, for confining the American commerce to the Mother-country, must either stand together, or fall together; for there is no medium: and whipping, fines, or imprisonments, are at least as great grievances as taxation. Indeed the Taunton petitioners have asserted in their petition to the throne, 'That the Act of Navigation hath been recognized by their fellow-subjects in America.' If by this they meant to say, that the American legislatures have passed an act or acts of their own to *authorize* this English act of parliament, and to make it *valid* in America, the petitioners have been ill advised to maintain such a groundless assertion; and those persons, who led them into this error, were much to blame.—The Dean of Gloucester, without precluding what Mr. Wesley may say in his own vindication, (if he should think it worth his while to answer such a writer) considers the above as a *full answer* to all the pretended arguments contained in the aforementioned boasted treatise. But he gives this public notice, that for the future he will have nothing to say to anonymous correspondents, or anonymous authors."

AMERICANUS'S

AMERICANUS'S REPLY.

To the Rev. Dr. TUCKER, Dean of Gloucester.

Reverend Sir,

THOUGH I assure you I am *totally unacquainted* with your anonymous correspondent *South*, and am exceedingly concerned that the rules of decorum should be so much transgressed as they are by that writer: yet as you have thought proper in reply to his letter, to give what you call a full answer to *Americanus's boasted treatise*, as you contemptuously stile it, I cannot well avoid introducing myself to your notice. Nor will I intrude upon you, sir, under a borrowed signature, but will annex my real name to what I may address to you, that you may no longer complain of me as an *anonymous* author, with whatever contempt you may still think fit to treat me. As I never embraced any sentiments religious or political, I was afraid or ashamed to own and defend, so I should never have sought concealment under a figurative signature, but that I wished to avoid the effects of those prejudices which lead men rather to consider *who writes*, than *what is written*.

" I think myself, sir, as happy as you can, in living under the auspicious government of King George the Third, and am *upon principle* (which you well know no *Tory* can be) most firmly and affectionately attached to his person and family; nor shall I make any other observation upon your bitter invectives against the *American Congress* than that *time was* when the *Convention of the States* of this kingdom was spoken of by the
 1 enemies

enemies of the Revolution, in much the same style you make use of in railing at the Congress.

"You are pleased to tell me, I was *egregiously mistaken* when I adopted the words of Lord Camden (who *ought* to understand the nature of the English constitution *as well* at least as the Dean of Gloucester) and said *there was not a blade of grass in England but was represented*.* And to prove that I was mistaken, you think it sufficient to observe, that there are *freeholders* in Gloucester, Hereford, and London, who have no votes for town or county. A *very laconic* but *decisive proof* of your assertion undoubtedly. It would have been rather more candid methinks, had you added the *reason* of these freeholders having no vote *as freeholders*, which you very well know is, because the constitution supposes the people in those several cities to give their voices as *freemen* or *liverymen*. That the representation here in England is imperfect, we allow, but that the spirit of the constitution supposes all the property in the kingdom to be disposed of by the proprietors, is incontestable. And so well read as you are in old statutes and records, it is needless to inform you, that till the 8th year of Henry the 6th, *all the residents* in a county were permitted to elect representatives, without any exception. If however, because the people are not adequately represented here, it may be argued that it is just and right to tax the Colonies *without any representation at all*; I wish to know why it might not as well be argued, that it would be also very right for the King and the Ministry to tax the people of England, if they thought proper, without *any representatives*.

* If there is a blade of grass in England not *directly* represented, *where* is that blade of grass?

representatives. Upon your principles, sir, what objection could be made to it? It would be only putting us all upon a level, those that *are represented* with those who are now *not represented*. If the *usage* of the kingdom be objected to it, so may the usage of the Colonies, who have ever since their existence taxed themselves by their own representatives, as the people of England and the people of Ireland do. Indeed I see not, upon your principles, if the supreme power should think fit to abrogate all future parliaments, or continue the present representatives, *durante vita*, how it could be objected to as *illegal* or *unconstitutional*. Nor is there any one political absurdity which may not, in my apprehension, be fairly deduced from the reasoning made use of by all the ministerial writers respecting the taxation of the Colonies.

“ Mr. *Wesley* however allows, that the Colonies have *a right to all granted them by royal charter*, so that with respect to him the matter must come to a short issue: for since the publication of my letter to that gentleman, I find that the charter granted to the *Massachusetts-Bay* by King William and Queen Mary, after the taking away of their former charter by the *quo warranto* of King Charles, expressly grants them the power of taxing themselves by their own representatives in their own assemblies. And this is all they plead for. For surely it will not be contended, that two taxing powers exist over one and the same people, as it might thus happen that the same tax might be laid by both at one and the same time, and innumerable oppressions be suffered without the possibility of redress.

“ I really hoped, Mr. Dean, from the very respectable idea I had formed of your character, that you had been above availing yourself of such *cobwebb'd sophistry*, as to pretend that the Americans are upon the *same foot* with the non-represented here, because they may purchase freeholds in England, and come over and vote at our general elections if they please, and that therefore if they do not chuse to take the trouble, *they have no right to complain*. Is this fair and candid, sir? You cannot think it so yourself. Setting aside the ridicule of supposing 20,000 or 30,000 Americans to cross the Atlantic, and come over to vote for Members of Parliament in England, we will suppose them willing to be at all this immense labour and expence, and that they actually come. But may not the Ministry laugh at these patriots when they are come, and tell them they are come *too soon*, or they are come *too late*, and may go home again as they came? The King is obliged to publish his writs for the calling of a new Parliament here, by the proper officers throughout the kingdom, that the electors may have time to assemble together, and chuse proper persons to represent them in Parliament. But is the King obliged to call his Parliament at any one precise period of time, or to give the *Americans* notice of his calling a new parliament, time enough for them to come over and exercise the right of election? To say nothing therefore of the difference arising from an American's having no vote, tho' he has ever so much property in America, unless he is also a freeholder or a voter of some class or other here,—how does it appear, but that the *Americans may still have a right to complain*.

plain, if they are taxed without being represented? Sir! I really blush to think that it should be possible for a scholar, a gentleman, a dignitary of the Church of England, to have recourse to such pitiful evasions to support the cause of party.

“ Your next argument, to prove that the Americans have as effectual a check upon the *abuse* of the power of taxation as the non-represented here, exceeds all the rest. ‘ If the American trade, you say, be in any degree so advantageous as they have reported it to be, a British Parliament cannot injure this trade by any mode of taxation, without injuring their own property in the decay of their manufactures, and the rent of their lands and houses.’ Are you in earnest, sir? If you are, I shall leave you in full possession of your argument, with only giving the public this simple illustration of it. A negro *slave* has a check upon the abuse of his master’s absolute power over him, because if his master *kills him*, he can be no longer useful to him. Such, O ye Americans, is the consolation offered you by the Dean of Gloucester! Such the check you have upon the *abuse* of the power of taxation! The British parliament *will not* tax you so as to take *every farthing* you have from you, BECAUSE you could no longer carry on trade, and consequently could no longer enrich them by your commerce. If this, sir, is *reasoning*, I wish to know what may be called *quibbling*?

“ I am glad to see you place the *dependence* of *Ireland*, and of the *Colonies* upon the same footing, because if it be consistent with the dependence

ence of Ireland, that they should tax themselves, it is impossible to invent a reason, why it should not be *equally consistent* with the dependence of the Colonies for them to tax themselves.

" I honor you for your declaration against *sanguinary* measures, and wish your Reverend Brethren here were actuated by the same pacific sentiments, whatever might be their particular political system. It would exalt their characters as ministers of him who came from heaven to proclaim on earth PEACE.

" As to the wit you favor us with about your *skin*, I have no objection to your proving that no one has a right to *cut thongs* from it without your consent, or that you ought to have a voice in laws that affect *life* as well as *property*; but cannot conceive how this in the least affects what is advanced by *Americanus*, to prove, that by the constitution of this kingdom a British subject has a right to a voice in the disposal of his property, and that, if he had not, he would be to all intents and purposes a *slave*.

" Having thus given you my free thoughts of your *full answer* to my *boasted treatise*, I leave the public to judge betwixt us. As nothing but the shock I received from Mr. *Wesley's* glaring inconsistency, in declaring to day the Americans are either *fools* or *knaves* if they submit to taxation; and then almost in the same breath telling us, that none but *king-haters* ever thought they *ought* not to submit to it; as nothing but this insult upon common sense, as well as integrity could have drawn me into the political world.

So I now most respectfully and gladly withdraw,
assuring you that, with a high esteem of your
learning and many virtues,

I am, Reverend Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Bristol, Oct. 27,
1775.

CALEB EVANS.

C O N T E N T S

L E T T E R I.

Introduction. Review of the controversy
betwixt Mr. *Wesley* and *Americanus*, with se-
veral original letters.

L E T T E R II.

Mr. FLETCHER's *rational* and *constitutional*
arguments in vindication of the "Calm Ad-
dress," considered, and confuted.

L E T T E R III.

His reasoning from SCRIPTURE, shewn to
be inconsistent, contradictory, absurd, and to-
tally inconclusive. His illiberality in introduc-
ing the Calvinists and Anabaptists, exposed.
Conclusion.

P O S T S C R I P T.

Dean of *Glocester*'s Defence of the "Calm
Address," and *Americanus*'s Answer.

Lately published by the same Author,

A LETTER to the Rev. Mr. *Wesley*, occasioned by his *Calm Address* to the American Colonies. A new edition, to which are prefixed some interesting observations on the Rev. Mr. *Wesley's* late reply to *Americanus*. Price 2s. 6d. per dozen.

British constitutional liberty, A sermon preached Nov. 5, 1775. Price 6d.



thor,

occa
merica
pres
e Ke
rice

reac